

The University of Chicago

METER AND DICTION IN CATULLUS'
HENDECASYLLABICS

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY
OF THE DIVISION OF THE HUMANITIES IN
CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF
PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF LATIN LANGUAGE
AND LITERATURE

1936

By
THOMAS CUTT

Private Edition, Distributed by
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

1936

The University of Chicago

METER AND DICTION IN CATULLUS'
HENDECASYLLABICS

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY
OF THE DIVISION OF THE HUMANITIES IN
CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF
PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF LATIN LANGUAGE
AND LITERATURE

1936

By
THOMAS CUTT

Private Edition, Distributed by
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

1936



PREFACE

To Professor H. W. Prescott, whose stimulating teaching led me to write on the present subject, and whose patient criticism is largely responsible for whatever of value may be found herein, my thanks are due. To Professor B. L. Ullman also I am indebted for several helpful suggestions.

Among the numerous editions of Catullus, I have made most frequent use of those of Kroll (2nd ed.; Leipzig: Teubner, 1929), Friedrich (Leipzig: Teubner, 1908), Merrill (Boston: Ginn & Co., 1893), Riese (Leipzig: Teubner, 1884), Ellis (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1876), and Baehrens (Leipzig: Teubner, 1876). To these I have referred throughout by name of editor alone.

Wetmore's Index Verborum Catullianus (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1912) was also of invaluable aid.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTORY	1
II. VERSE-STRUCTURE	13
III. WORD-TYPES AND THEIR POSITIONS IN THE VERSE	28
IV. RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN VERSE-STRUCTURE AND DICTION: THE END OF THE VERSE	34
V. RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN VERSE-STRUCTURE AND DICTION: THE PYRRHIC SEQUENCE	58

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY

The present study is an attempt to estimate the general influence of meter on diction in the hendecasyllabics of Catullus, by examining certain outstanding relationships between the requirements of the verse and the language used.

That the language of poetry was influenced by the restrictions involved in versification was recognized even in ancient times. Cicero¹ and Quintilian² speak of the language of the poets as affected by metrical necessity. Lucilius,³ Horace,⁴ and Martial,⁵ poets themselves, directly mention the impossibility of using certain words in their verses. The satirist, Lucian,⁶ ridicules the artifices used in overcoming the difficulties of versification. The scholiasts sometimes have notes on words the use of which they consider due to the meter.⁷

Modern scholarship has devoted but little systematic study to the matter. About a century ago, Köne⁸ examined the language of the Roman epic writers to discover how they had overcome the difficulties of moulding the language into dactylics. His work was but little noticed, until Bednara re-opened the question in a study of the dactylic verse of Catullus and Ovid.⁹ Schneider has made a similar study of the various meters of Martial,¹⁰ and Engel, of Horace.¹¹

¹Orat. 202.

²Inst. 1. 6. 2; viii. 6. 17.

³vi. 229, Marx.

⁴Serm. 1. 5. 87.

⁵ix. 11.

⁶Timon 1.

⁷Examples given in Norden, Aeneis VI (3rd ed.; Leipzig, 1926), p. 114.

⁸Sprache der röm. Epiker (Münster, 1840).

⁹"De sermone dactyl. Lat.," ALL, XIV (1906), 317 f., 532 f.

¹⁰De Martialis sermone (Breslau, 1909).

¹¹De Horatii sermone (Breslau, 1914).

Homeric scholarship has also benefited from researches of the same sort. Parry has shown that the fixed epithet and other features of Homeric style are largely due to their usefulness in oral verse-making,¹ and Nilsson, accepting his conclusions, makes them a link in his chain of evidence regarding the development of epic technique.²

The value of such studies is now being recognized. Norden says:

"Eine systematische Untersuchung wäre dringend erwünscht, da unter diesem Gesichtspunkt viele Erscheinungen, die wir uns gewöhnt haben mit dem farblosen Wort 'poetisch' zu bezeichnen, sich vielmehr als metrische Surrogate erweisen und als solche stets für die formale, oft auch für die sachliche Exegese von Wichtigkeit sind."³

So also, Kroll, in a chapter on the language of Latin poetry, attributes considerable importance to this matter.⁴

It is obvious that the metrical form of certain words precludes their use in verse, as, for example, words of the form,⁵ 0 0 0 -, - 0 - 0, - 0 - -, and various others, in dactyls.⁶ Further, even those that can be used must be combined only with certain others, as, for example, in dactyls, a word of the form, 0 -, may be used only in combination with - 0, - - 0, 0 - 0, etc. But besides a set sequence of quantities, a definite kind of 'verse-structure' may also be required in certain places in the line, and thus, certain words, even though they have the required quantities, cannot be used in those places. For example, in the middle of the elegiac pentameter, the syllables are: 00 - // - 0 0, but words of the form, - - -, 0 - -, 0 0 - -, - - 0, - - 0 0, though having the required quantities, cannot be used because they would run through the diaeresis. Again, at the end of hexameter, so far as quantities are concerned, words of the form, 0, - 0, 0 - 0, 0 0 -

¹L'épithète traditionnelle chez Homère (Paris, 1928). Cf. his "Studies in the Epic Technique of Oral Verse-making: I, Homer and Homeric Style," Harvard Studies in Class. Phil., XLI (1930), 73.

²Homer and Mycenae (London, 1933), pp. 179 f., et passim.

³Loc. cit.

⁴Studien zum Verständnis d. röm. Lit. (Stuttgart, 1924), pp. 257 f.

⁵The symbol, 0, represents a short syllable; -, a long; 0, a syllable which is either long or short.

⁶For the extensive vocabulary thus debarred from dactyls, see Bednara, loc. cit., p. 319.

Θ, - 0 0 - Θ, etc. might stand, but the masters of Latin hexameter, as a rule, allow only, - Θ and 0 - Θ.¹ Thus the language of poetry is limited not only by the fixity of the sequence of syllables, but also by restrictions involved in the 'verse-structure' in certain places.

In the present study, therefore, it is necessary first to discover whether the hendecasyllabics of Catullus have any such principles of verse-structure, and if so, what these principles are. In this matter, since the theory of the rhythm is by no means definitely established,² it would be idle to make deductions from it. Hence, the argument herein is independent of any metrical theory and avoids the technical terms of metric. Rather, an analysis of the verse-structure in Catullus has been made on a statistical basis, without reference or appeal to any theory of the meter. For this purpose, the tables, given pp. 7-12, are presented. The tables show the positions of each type of word in the verse, the number of times each is used, and so forth, as explained in the following:

In the tables, and in the discussion of them, the term, 'word-type,' is used meaning the sequence of quantities in a given word as it stands by itself; for example, pessimam is of the word-type, - 0 0. The term, 'verse-type,' is used meaning the sequence of quantities supplied by a word in a given position in the verse; for example, pessimam before a word beginning with a consonant

¹Norden, op. cit., p. 437.

²Involving, as it does, the much disputed question of the origin, development, and nature of Aeolic verse (for a summary of the dispute, see White, Verse of Gr. Comedy [London, 1912], pp. xiii f.). According to older theory (defended comparatively recently by Goodell, Greek Metric [New York, 1901], and Shorey, "Choriambic Dimeter," TAPA, XXXVIII [1907], 57 f., and still widely adopted in college texts and manuals, e.g. Postgate, Prosodia Latina [Oxford, 1923]), the Phalaecean is a logaoedic pentameter of the form: Θ Θ/- 0 0/- 0/- 0/- Θ. The 'new metric' holds that it is a trimeter, developed from the Glyconic, of the form: Θ Θ - 0/0 - 0 -/0 -. - (recently discussed by Koster, "De Glyconei et Pherecratei origine," Philol., LXXX [1925], 353 f. and Münscher, "Metr. Beiträge," Hermes, LVI [1921], 66 f.). Wilamowitz's theory that the Phalaecean is a development of the Ionic ("De versu Phal.," Mélanges Weil [Paris, 1898], pp. 449 f.) he himself rejects (cf. his Griech. Verskunst [Berlin, 1921], pp. 137, 105, 251), and it is now generally disregarded (cf. however, Heinze, "Lyr. Verse des Horaz," Ber. sächs. Gesell. Wiss., phil.-hist. Kl., LXX [1918], Heft 4, pp. 10 f.).

forms the verse-type, - 0 -; elided, the verse-type, - 0. In many cases, word-type and verse-type are the same, and when there is no need for distinction, the term, 'type,' alone is used meaning the sequence of quantities in a single word.

Table I shows the distribution of monosyllabic types; II, of dissyllabic; III, of trisyllabic, etc. The one instance of a seven-syllable type is listed at the bottom of Table VI. Table VII shows the cases of elided monosyllables.

On the left side of each table, the eleven syllables of the verse are represented by eleven narrow columns. In these columns are indicated the various possible positions of verse-types of one, or two, or three, etc. syllables, on separate lines, numbered, 1, 2, 3, etc. and hereinafter referred to as position 1, 2, 3, etc. The number of instances of each verse-type is given opposite it in the central column; for example, Table II, position 1 shows the verse-type, - -, at the beginning of the verse 130 times.

The right-hand part of each table shows the word-types of which the verse-types are formed, word-types being listed in columns numbered I, II, III, etc. hereinafter referred to as column I, II, III, etc. Thus, Table II, position 1 shows the verse-type, - -, used altogether 130 times, formed 44 times of the word-type, - 0, with the ultima lengthened before a consonant (indicated x), column III; 66 times, of the word-type, - -, column IV; 20 times, of trisyllables elided, - - (e). These columns also show the various verse-types formed by the same word-type, and the number of each. For example, Table II, column I shows the word-type, 0 0, giving the verse-type, 0 0, 137 times, position 7; giving the verse-type, 0 -, 10 times, position 3; 3 times, position 5; 13 times, position 8; 57 times, position 10; 3 times, position 12.

The Teubner text was followed as a convenient standard for making the tables.¹ Altogether, Catullus has 552 hendeca-

¹Merrill (Leipzig: Teubner, 1923). Not that the readings therein adopted are regarded as definitive. Some few variants, which bear directly on the theory advanced below, are discussed in the text. There are, however, relatively few variants, metrically admissible, which would change the statistics of the tables, as e.g. quod o / quidem, 1. 9; unanimos / uno animo, 9. 4; satis beatus / sat es beatus, 23. 27; hercule ei et / hercule et, 38. 2; Most important variants involve but one word, and being metrical equivalents, do not affect the statistics, as e.g. arida / arido, 1. 2; adquiescat / acquiescet, 2. 8; negatam / ligatam, 2. 13; vestra / nostra, 26. 1; ebrioso acino / ebriosa acina, 27. 4; patronus / patronum, 49. 7. Hence variants affect the statistics relatively little, and since in any case the conclusions drawn

syllabics,¹ but the tables include only 527, the following being omitted: 10 lines which are identical with others, and hence of no independent significance as to verse-structure;² 15 which are irregular in form, having one long instead of the usual two shorts in the fourth and fifth syllables of the line.³

Some few words, because of ambiguous quantities, may give two different word-types. Such ambiguous syllables were counted as long or short according to their quantity in the verse in which they occur. Thus, syllables containing a short vowel which may be pronounced as either open or closed; for example, *nigris*, 43.2, was counted under the word-type, 0 -. Mihi, tibi, sibi, and ubi, were counted as the word-types, 0 0, or 0 -, according to their scansion in the verses in which they occur; when elided, as 0 (0). The same rule was applied in classifying words with iambic shortening, as, for example, *mane*, 10.27; *cave*, 50.18, 19; similarly, *repente*, 10.3; *commoda*, 10.26; and some few words with irregular or alternative scansion, as for example, *Italorum*, 1.5; *Cyrenis*, 7.4; *Asiae*, 46.6; *ait*, 53.4. So also in the case of certain peculiarities of scansion: the 'i' in *Camerium*, 55.10, was taken as consonantal, making the word trisyllabic, with the second syllable long; *Ravide*, 40.1, and *vehemens*, 50.21, were scanned as cases of internal contraction; *soluit*, 2.13, trisyllabic with diaeresis; *te*, 55.4, shortened in prosodic hiatus. Certain proper names, otherwise unattested, occur at the beginning of the verse, where the quantities are ambiguous. In such cases the syllables involved were assumed to be long: *Verani*, 9.1, and elsewhere; *Vibenni*, 33.2; *Ameana*, 41.1.

The enclitics, -cum, -ne, -que, and -ve, were counted as part of the words to which they are appended; for example, *rumoresque*, 5.2, was classified as the type, - - - 0. Compounds also were counted as single types, such as aliquis, atque, nescioquis, quandoquidem, quare, quomodo, scilicet.⁴ These were counted in making the tables as single types, because, since they are regularly

from them are based on comparative percentages, variant readings, though of significance for the structure of individual lines, do not appreciably affect the general conclusions.

¹Cc. 1 - 3, 5 - 7, 9, 10, 12 - 16, 21, 23, 24, 26 - 28, 32, 33, 35, 36, 38, 40 - 43, 45 - 50, 53 - 58b.

²23. 4; 16. 14; 24. 2; 36. 20; 42. 19, 20; 43. 5; 45. 17, 18; 57. 10.

³55. 1, 3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22; 58b. 1, 9.

⁴*Beatu's*, 23. 27, was also counted as a single type, since it is the only instance of suppression of final 's' (if, indeed, it be the right reading), and it would be pointless to make special provision for it in the tables.

written together in an invariable order, they are single units as potential verse-types; thus, the two elements in rumoresque, quare, and the like, except in rare cases, cannot form two separate verse-types, placed in different positions in the line.¹

For statistics in other kinds of verse in Catullus, as also in other authors, ambiguous quantities, enclitics and compounds were counted in the same way.

Martial,² the most important of other writers of hendecasyllabics,³ having 2070 verses extant,⁴ is compared with Catullus at the salient points of the discussion throughout.

¹The words in groups such as ausus es, l. 5; meae puellae, 2. 1, and others involving 'sentence enclisis' were counted separately in making up the tables, because such groups are not necessarily written together in an invariable order, and the two elements are potentially two separate verse-types. Thus, e.g. if ausus es, l. 5, be counted as single types, confusion arises in such cases as: nox est perpetua una dormienda, 5. 6; similarly, if meae puellae, 2. 1, be regarded as a single element, it is difficult to classify: meas esse aliquid putare nugas, l. 4. Hence all such sentence enclitics were counted separately in making up the tables. In the discussion that follows, however, such word-groups as affect the conclusions drawn from the tables will be pointed out.

²Heraeus (Leipzig: Teubner, 1925).

³See list, infra, p. 25, n. 2.

⁴i. 1, 7, 17, 27, 35, 41, 52, 54, 64, 69, 72, 82, 86, 94, 99, 102, 104, 106, 109, 115, 117; ii. 4, 6, 13, 15, 23, 33, 37, 41, 44, 48, 54, 55, 68, 70, 83, 86, 92; iii. 2, 12, 35, 44, 53, 67, 73, 84, 96, 98; iv. 2, 4, 6, 9, 14, 21, 23, 28, 30, 39, 43, 46, 50, 55, 64, 77, 84, 86, 89; v. 2, 6, 8, 12, 20, 24, 39, 44, 49, 56, 60, 70, 73, 78, 80, 84; vi. 1, 4, 8, 14, 17, 19, 22, 24, 28, 30, 37, 42, 49, 55, 62, 66, 70, 72, 78, 82, 90, 92; vii. 4, 11, 17, 31, 34, 39, 45, 48, 55, 60, 67, 70, 72, 76, 79, 86, 89, 95, 97; viii. 2, 5, 16, 25, 35, 38, 40, 42, 52, 54, 64, 66, 69, 72, 76, 79, 81; ix. 9, 11, 19, 40, 42, 44, 52, 57, 62, 87, 90; x. 7, 9, 20, 24, 35, 38, 40, 47, 49, 52, 55, 65, 67, 72, 76, 78, 83, 87, 90, 98, 102, 104; xi. 1, 6, 13, 15, 18, 24, 31, 35, 40, 51, 63, 66, 72, 75, 88, 106; xii. 7, 8, 15, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24, 26, 30, 34, 36, 37, 39, 41, 43, 45, 47, 49, 53, 55, 59, 61, 63, 67, 69, 71, 73, 75, 77, 79, 83, 85, 89, 91, 93, 95, 97; xiii. 81; xiv. 8, 10, 37, 39, 40, 52, 56, 148, 206,-- 2070 verses in all. Cf. Giarratano, De Martialis re metr. (Naples, 1908), p. 49. Meyer, "Cäsar im Hendekasyll.", Sitzungsber. bayr. Akad., II (1889), 221, and Lease, "Diaeresis at every Foot," Cl. Rev., XI (1897), 149, have miscounted.

TABLE I

One-syllable Verse-types													Number of each Word-type used		
Possible												Num-ber used	I 0	II -	Two-Syl-lables Elided
1	-											255	x113	115	27
2	0											9	5		4
3	-											151	x39	81	31
4	0											1	1		
5	-											115	x43	66	6
6		0										8	4		4
7			0									13	8		5
8			-									115	x62	50	3
9				0								46	16		30
10				-								47	x22	23	2
11					0							26	16		10
12					-							3	x1	1	1
13						0						0	0		
14					-							15		15	

TABLE II

Two-syllable Verse-types										Number of each Word-type used					
Possible										Num- ber used	I 00	II 0-	III -0	IV --	Three- Syl- lables Elided
1	-	-								130			x44	66	20
2	-	0								11			11		
3	0	-								18	x10	5			3
4	-	-								80			x32	47	1
5	0	-								7	x3	4			
6		-	0							21			17		4
7			0	0						156	137				19
8			0	-						26	x13	10			3
9				-	0					80			67		13
10				0	-					164	x57	97			10
11					-	0				19			17		2
12					0	-				7	x3	0			4
13						-	0			62			62		
14							-	-		87				87	

TABLE III

Three-syllable Verse-types										Number of each Word-type used									
Possible										Num- ber used	I 000	II 00-	III 0-0	IV 0--	V -00	VI -0-	VII --0	VIII ---	Four- Syl- lables Elided
1	-	-	-							64							x26	33	5
2	-	0	-							8					x1	6			1
3	0	-	-							10			x5	5					
4	-	-	0							6							6		
5	0	-	0							0			0						
6	-	0	0	0						101					81				20
7		0	0	-						112	x40	71							1
8			0	-	0					6			6						
9			-	0	-					49					x20	26			3
10				0	-	0				77			77						
11				-	0	-				3					x0	1			2
12					0	-	0			108			108						
13						0	-	-		123				123					

TABLE IV

Four-syllable Verse-types										Number of each Word-type used									
Possible										Num- ber used	I 00-0	II 0-00	III -000	IV -00-	V -0-0	VI -0--	VII --00	VIII ---0	Five- Syl- lables Elided
1	-	-	-	0						10								8	2
2	-	0	-	0						2					2				
3	0	-	-	0						0									
4	-	-	0	0						14							14		
5	0	-	0	0						0		0							
6	-	0	0	0	-					71			x23	47					1
7		0	0	-	0					7	7								
8			0	-	0	-				1		x1							
9			-	0	-	0				30					29				1
10			0	-	0	-				1		0							1
11				-	0	-	0			49					49				
12				-	0	-	-			22						22			

TABLE V

Five-syllable Verse-types											Number of each Word-type used										
Possible											Num- ber used	I 00-000	II -0-00	III 0-0-0	IV --0-00	V 00-0-0	VI 0-00-	VII --000	VIII --00-	IX ---00	Six- Syll. Elide
1	-	-	-	0	0						5								5		
2	-	0	-	0	0						2										
3	0	-	-	0	0						2										
4	-	-	0	0	-						5					x2		3			
5	0	-	0	0	-						0										
6	-	0	0	-	0						1				1						
7		0	0	-	0	-					1	x1									
8		0	-	0	-	0					0		0								
9		-	0	-	0	-					1					x0				1	
10			0	-	0	-	0				31		31								
11			0	-	0	-	-				11			11							

TABLE VI

Six-syllable Types
(Verse-types and
Word-types
the Same)

Possible										Number used			
1	-	-	-	0	0	-				1			
2	0	0	-	0	0	-				0			
3		0	-	0	0	-	0			0			
4			-	0	0	-	0	-		2			
5				0	0	-	0	-	0	0			
6					0	-	0	-	0	-	0		
7						-	0	-	0	-	0	16	
8							-	0	-	0	-	-	2
Seven-syl.	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	1			

TABLE VII

Elided Monosyllables

										Number		
0	0	-	0	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	Long	Short
0											1	2
+											5	0
	0										6	5
		+									1	0
			0								4	1
						+					3	0
							0				0	1

CHAPTER II

VERSE-STRUCTURE

The End of the Verse

As is usual in Latin poetry, monosyllables at the end of the verse are avoided. Table I, position 14 lists 15 instances, but in all except 3 cases, the final monosyllable goes so closely together in utterance with the preceding word that the two words form virtually a single unit: est with procope,¹ Catullo est, 7. 10; visum est, 10. 3; invenusta est, 12. 5; necesse est, 12. 16; elegantiusve est, 13. 10; necesse est, 16. 6; salillo est, 23. 19; invenustum est, 36. 17; facillimumque est, 38. 4;² pronoun, object of a preposition immediately preceding,³ ad me, 10. 31; apud me, 13. 1; a te, 50. 20.

In the three remaining instances, the monosyllable at the end of the verse has a special effect.⁴ The position of lux, 5. 5, at the end of the line heightens the contrast with nox at the beginning of the next. Similarly, nox, 7. 7, at the end of the line helps to heighten the effect of furtivos at the beginning of the next, since night-time and thievery go together, especially the thieveries of love. Est, 24. 7, in answer to the question, Non est homo bellus? gains a special concessive emphasis by its position.

Monosyllables, then, are debarred from the end of the verse. Of dissyllabic types at the end of the verse there are 149, Table II, positions 13, 14; of trisyllabic, 231, Table III, positions 12, 13; of four-syllable, 71, Table IV, positions 11, 12; of five, 42, Table V, positions 10, 11; of six, 18, Table VI, positions 7, 8; and one of seven, Table VI. The striking fact in this list is that types of three or more syllables occur at the end of the verse 363 times - that is, in approximately 69 per cent of the

¹Lindsay, The Latin Language (Oxford, 1894), p. 121.

²So also molestum est, 55. 1, which was not included in making up the tables (see p. 5, supra). In labos est, 55. 13, which was also omitted from the tables, est is enclitic (see p. 16, infra on ausus es, etc.).

³See infra, p. 16, on per iter.

⁴Cf. Norden, Aeneis VI (3rd ed.; Leipzig, 1926), p. 440.

lines.¹ That the occurrence of so many longer endings² is due to a definite preference for such endings is shown by the fact that, whereas verse-types of three or more syllables comprise hardly 36 per cent of the total vocabulary, about 69 per cent of the lines end with such types.

The preference is still clearer from the following figures: of the total number of dissyllabic verse-types, only about 17 per cent fall at the end of the verse, Table II, whereas of those of three or four syllables, about 34 per cent, Tables III, IV; of five, about 71 per cent, Table V; of six, about 86 per cent, Table VI. Thus the percentage of instances used at the end of the verse is from two to five times as great among longer verse-types as among dissyllabic.

Again the preference for longer endings in this kind of verse is shown by the comparatively smaller proportion of such endings in other kinds of verse in Catullus. In other 'logaoedic' verses,³ longer endings comprise about 40 per cent; in iambics,⁴ about 48 per cent; in dactylic hexameter,⁵ about 41 per cent. It is only in Galliambics and elegiac pentameters that the proportion of longer endings is very great, about 66 per cent⁶ and 60 per cent⁷ respectively, but hendecasyllabics have an even greater proportion of longer endings.

To sum up: at the end of the verse, monosyllables are debarred, dissyllables are allowed, but longer endings are generally preferred.⁸

¹Here we might also include apud me, 13. 1, and 8 of the cases of final est with procope (cf. p.13, supra), as forming endings of three or more syllables; this would make 372, over 70 per cent.

²The term, 'longer ending,' hereinafter denotes a word of three or more syllables standing at the end of the verse.

³Sapphic, cc. 11, 51; Glyconic, cc. 34, 61; Priapean, c. 17; Asclepiadean major, c. 30; 329 verses, with 130 longer endings.

⁴Iambic trimeter, cc. 4, 29, 52; tetrameter, c. 25; choliambic, cc. 8, 22, 31, 37, 39, 44, 59, 60; 194 verses, with 94 longer endings.

⁵Cc. 62, 64, and the hexameter lines of cc. 65-116; 795 verses, with 329 longer endings.

⁶C. 63; 93 verses, with 62 longer endings.

⁷Cc. 65-116; 322 pentameter verses, with 193 longer endings.

⁸Martial has 65 monosyllabic endings, 596 dissyllabic, 1087 trisyllabic, 214 of four syllables, 91 of five, 17 of six, -- 1409 longer endings, about 68 per cent. If final enclitics be

The Pyrrhic Sequence

The pyrrhic sequence¹ is supplied by the verse-types:
O O, 156 times, Table II, position 7; - O O, 101 times, O O -, 112 times, Table III, positions 6, 7; - - O O, 14 times, - O O -, 71 times, O O - O, 7 times, Table IV, positions 4, 6, 7; 0 0 - O O, 9 times, - - O O -, 5 times, - O O - O, once, O O - O -, once, Table V, positions, 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7; - - - O O -, once, - O O - O -, twice, Table VI, positions 1, 4. Thus in 480 instances the two shorts forming the pyrrhic sequence belong to the same word. By contrast, in only 47 lines do these two syllables belong to separate words, with a word-end falling between them: the type, O, 8 times, Table I, position 6; - O, 21 times, Table II, position 6; - - O, 6 times, Table III, position 4; - 0 - O, 12 times, Table IV, positions 1, 2; - 47 instances, the sequence being completed by: O, 13 times, Table I, position 7; O -, 26 times, Table II, position 8; O - O, 6 times, Table III, position 8; O - O -, once, Table IV, position 8; O - O - O - O, once, Table VI.

Certain further considerations make it still clearer that the poet avoided dividing the pyrrhic sequence between two words. Word-ends occur at the fourth syllable, thus dividing the pyrrhic, only 47 times, whereas word-ends occur from three to seven times as often at every other syllable in the line, except the tenth, where a word-end would necessitate a monosyllabic ending; at the first syllable there are 264 word-ends; at the second, 311; at the third, 284; at the fifth, 293; at the sixth, 330; at the seventh, 140; at the eighth, 264; at the ninth, 152.²

Again, in other kinds of verse in Catullus, divided pyrrhics³ occur more than two or three times as often as in hendecasyllabics. The latter have hardly 9 per cent, whereas other kinds

counted with the words to which they are appended, the figures are about 20, 599, 1093, 245, 93, and 20,-- 1451 longer endings, about 70 per cent. Cf. Giarratano, De Martialis re metr. (Naples, 1908), p. 54.

¹By 'pyrrhic sequence,' is meant the two shorts forming the fourth and fifth syllables of the line.

²Word-ends as shown by the tables; this does not except cases of elision.

³By 'divided pyrrhic' is meant a sequence of two shorts the first of which belongs to one word in the verse, the second to the word following.

of 'logaoedic' verse¹ have more than 22 per cent, and hexameters and elegiacs² have about 30 per cent.

Finally, even in the cases in which the pyrrhic in hendecasyllabics is divided, the two words involved, in most instances, go closely together in utterance.³

Thus, a preposition with its case,⁴ in: qui nunc it per iter tenebricosum, 3. 11.

In the following, the second of the two words is in each case a form of the verb, sum, closely joined with the first:⁵ iam tum cum ausus es unus Italorum, 1. 5; nam mellitus erat, suamque norat, 3. 6; respondi id quod erat, nihil neque ipsis, 10. 9; at mi nullus erat neque hic neque illic, 10. 21; qua solatus es adlocutione, 38. 5.

Similarly in the following, the second of the two words is a sentence enclitic: sed tu insulsa male⁶ et molesta vivis, 10. 33; persequamur eam⁷ et reflagitemus, 42. 6; hoc iucunde tibi⁸

¹See p. 14, supra, n. 3.

²Ce. 62, 64-116. The only other kind of verse in Catullus in which pyrrhic sequences occur is Galliambic, c. 63. Comparison, however, is not indicative because, since pyrrhic sequences in that meter occur either at the beginning of the line or immediately following the diaeresis, the only verse-type that could give rise to divided pyrrhics is the monosyllabic type, 0. Hence there are but few: per opaca, 32; sed ubi, 39; ut apud, 53; et earum, 54; quod enim, 62; eg(o) ephebus, 63; eg(o) eram, 64; niv(e) amicta, 70; ub(i) aper, 72; fac ut hunc, 78; fac uti, 79; at ubi, 87.

³Similarly, of the 2070 lines of Martial, 1892, over 91 per cent, have undivided pyrrhics, and in such as are divided, the two words involved go closely together.

⁴Radford, "Latin Word-groups," AJP, XXV (1904), 263; Vendryes, L'intensité initiale (Paris, 1902), p. 108; Lindsay, op. cit., p. 168; Fraenkel, Iktus und Akzent (Berlin, 1928), p. 362.

⁵Lindsay, "On Plautine Metre," JP, XX (1892), 143. Cf. Lat. Lang., p. 167.

⁶Fraenkel, op. cit., pp. 48 f.; Hofmann, Lat. Umgangs-sprache (Heidelberg, 1926), p. 74.

⁷Lindsay, Lat. Lang., p. 167; cf. his Captivi (London, 1900), p. 369.

⁸The vocative, iucunde, involves no pause. For literature on this peculiarity of vocatives, see Norden, op. cit., p. 386, n. 1; Fraenkel, op. cit., p. 16, n. 3; Drexler, Plautin. Akzentstudien (Breslau, 1932), III, 33, s. v. Vokativ. The enclitic, tibi, may,

poema feci, 50. 16.

In the following, the first of the two words is a proclitic pronominal:¹ illuc unde negant redire quemquam, 3. 12; quare, quidquid habes boni malique, 6. 15; illuc unde malum pedem attulisti, 14. 22; verum, siquid ages, statim iubeto, 32. 9; ride, quidquid amas, Cato, Catullum, 56. 3; non hic quam ille magis vorax adulter, 57. 8.

In the following, infinitive and verb probably go closely together:² hoc salsum esse putas? fugit te, inepte, 12. 4; nam castum esse decet pium poetam, 16. 5; pedicare cupis meos amores, 21. 4.

Again, in some lines elision serves to join the two words closely together. For the present we are not concerned with the question of the extent to which elided syllables were suppressed in pronunciation,³ nor with the problem of the effect of elision on the accentuation of word-groups.⁴ That elision brings two words close together in utterance is agreed.⁵ Thus, in the following: argutati(o) inambulatioque, 6. 11; et vino et sal(e) et omnibus cachinnis, 13. 5; quantum vis, ub(i) erit⁶ foris paratum, 15. 12;

therefore, go closely with iucunde. For the enclisis of tibi, see especially Fraenkel, op. cit., p. 32; Drexler, op. cit., III, 39, s. v. mihi.

¹Radford, "Latin Accent and Metric," TAPA, XXXV (1904), 33 ff.; note especially pp. 43-46; Lindsay, Lat. Lang., p. 167. Cf. Drexler, op. cit., I, 219 f.

²Fraenkel, op. cit., pp. 145 ff. considers almost any group of infinitive and verb as having an 'enge Verknüpfung;' cf. especially p. 149. Cf. also Radford, TAPA, XXXV, 45, n. 2, 4. It may be, however, that the above examples, and indeed others herein mentioned, might better be considered under the head of iambic words (putas, decet, cupis) the enclitic tendency of which, in certain word-groups at least, is well recognized. Cf. Radford, AJP, XXV, 419, and the works there cited; Drexler, op. cit., I, 122 ff.

³On which, see Harkness, "Relation of Accent to Elision," TAPA, XXXVI (1905), 82, and the works cited in n. 2. Cf. Sturtevant and Kent, "Elision and Hiatus," TAPA, XLVI (1915), 129 f.

⁴Cf. Harkness, ibid.; Drexler, op. cit., I, 103; Fraenkel, op. cit., p. 14 and n. 1; Lindsay, Early Lat. Verse (Oxford, 1922), p. 34.

⁵See Drexler and Fraenkel, ibid.; Lindsay, ibid., pp. 102f., Klotz, Grundzüge altröm. Metrik (Leipzig, 1890), pp. 80, 343, 352.

⁶Cf. supra, p. 16, on ausus es, etc., and Drexler, op. cit., I, 142.

qui tum deniqu(e) habent salem ac leporem, 16. 7; nec cimex nequ(e)¹ araneus neque ignis, 23. 2; sole et frigor(e) et esuritione, 23. 14; circumsistit(e) eam,² et reflagitate, 42. 10; ni te perdit(e) amo atque amare porro, 45. 3; urbana alter(a) et illa Formiana, 57. 4; essem te mih(i) amice³ quaeritando, 58b. 10.

Similarly, the 'semi-elision'⁴ brings the two words close together in: te in circo, tē in omnibus libellis, 55. 4.

In one line, the first of the two words is the closely joined⁵ connective, atque: plus quam se atque suos amavit omnes, 58. 3.

In the following, the first of the two shorts is formed of the enclitics, -que or -ne, in phrases pronounced closely together:⁶ rumoresque senum severiorum, 5. 2; pulvinusque peraeque et hic et ille, 6. 9; venistine domum⁷ ad tuos penates, 9. 3; desissemque truces vibrare iambos, 36. 5; quot sunt quotque fuere, Marce Tulli, 49. 2; ventorumque simul⁸ require cursum, 58b. 6.

The following seem to be more open violations of the rule:

¹Cf. atque suos, 58. 3, infra.

²Cf. supra, p. 16, on persequamur eam.

³The vocative involves no pause; see supra, p. 16, n. 8.

⁴For the latest discussion of this matter, see Drexler, op. cit., II, 292 f., and n. 1 for recent literature. Note, in this connection p. 340, where he claims that the reason why the accentuation, quī ámat, is common in Plautus, whereas quis ámat is relatively rare, is that quī ámat go closely together because of the 'semi-elision' or 'prosodic hiatus.' Cf. Norden, op. cit., p. 265.

⁵Cf. Lindsay, Lat. Lang., p. 203: "All these (atque, neque, etc.) are words which would naturally be closely joined in utterance with a following word." Harkness, loc. cit., p. 88, is doubtless right in claiming that even where there is a sense pause after atque (Lucret. i. 980), "there is but a slight pause, if any."

⁶Lindsay, ibid., p. 598, suggests that such groups of words in actual speech were uttered so closely together that -que suffered the same syncope as in the connectives, atque and neque. Again, pp. 203 f., he explains the loss of final 'e' in such forms as viden as due in part at least to the tendency to pronounce closely together the pair of words between which -ne occurs. Cf. his Early Lat. Verse, pp. 71 f. and Skutsch there cited.

⁷Cf. Fraenkel, op. cit., p. 56, who claims that domum in such expressions goes closely with its verb.

⁸Cf. Fraenkel, ibid., p. 52, on simul.

si qui forte mearum ineptiarum, 14b. 1; a te sudor abest, abest saliva, 23. 16; quaeque Ancona Cnidumque harundinosam, 36. 13; pleni ruris et inficetiarum, 36. 19; at defessa labore membra postquam, 50. 14.

There remain some few cases for special consideration.

In l. 9, qualecumque quod o patrona virgo, qualecumque is usually taken along with quidquid hoc libelli of the preceding line. But the thought is complete with libelli, and this is the more striking because it is the end of a line, where some slight pause is expected. It seems natural, therefore, to make a full stop at libelli. Qualecumque would then go with what follows, with quod as an 'inverted' relative,¹ the meaning being: 'And may it (quod), whatever its worth (qualecumque), etc.'² This seems the natural way to read the passage,³ and besides, it gives a neat balance and contrast between quidquid hoc libelli, which depreciates the intrinsic value of the book as a gift to his friend, and qualecumque, its artistic merit as an offering to the muse. If this interpretation is right,⁴ quod is enclitic,⁵ and there is no pause after qualecumque.

The line 6. 12, is usually given as: nam nil stupra valet, nihil, tacere (Haupt). The MSS readings, nam inista praeualet, O, and nam ni ista praeualet, GR, are meaningless. The fact that they are also unmetrical suggests that the corruption originated in a misplacement of words. The reading may have been: nam nil praeualet ista, nil, tacere. This is nearer to the MSS than the generally accepted reading, and avoids stupra, a word which Catullus would scarcely have used of his friend's love-affair even in jest, for, as Kroll points out, it always has a censorious meaning. It is needless to determine the matter here, for the line cannot be used for or against the present argument. If, however, the general principles herein set forth be accepted, some such emendation as above suggested must be given serious consideration, especially

¹Common in poetry; cf. Norden, op. cit., pp. 324, 402; Schünke, De traiectione coniunc. (Kiel, 1906), p. 71.

²Cf. Horace Serm. i. 10. 88, quibus haec, sint qualiacumque, adridere velim.

³The reading, libelli est, of the inferior MSS shows that some readers construed the passage in this way.

⁴And it may be added that, if the general theory herein presented be accepted, the rhythm requires the above interpretation; cf. infra, pp. 26 f.

⁵Stolz-Schmalz, Lat. Grammat. (5th ed. revised by Leumann-Hofmann; München, 1928), p. 612.

since OGR have praeualet, which is justifiable Latin and would give the line a more normal structure.

There are three divided pyrrhics in c. 41, and it would seem that the unusual rhythm here serves a special purpose. The complete poem is:

Ameana / puella defututa¹
totā milia me decem poposcit,
istā turpiculo puella naso,
decoctoris / amica Formiani.
5 propinqui, quibus est puella curae,
amicos medicosque convocate:
non est sanā / puella, nec rogare
qualis sit solet aes imuginosum.

Puella is used four times, vv. 1, 3, 5, 7, that is, in every odd line. In the first and last instance, it is set out by the unusual rhythm of the divided pyrrhic. Furthermore, v. 4 stands out against v. 1; the two lines correspond in structure word for word. And besides having the same rhythm, they balance each other also in thought and in sound: puella, upon whom the attention is centered, is balanced by amica; decoctoris echoes defututa in both sound and implication; Formiani echoes Ameana in much the same way, both being proper names, and both having a similar sound. It is further to be noted that the comparatively slower rhythm of vv. 1 and 4 contrasts with the quicker rhythm of vv. 2 and 3, both of which begin with the unusual sequence, - O, and that the four lines form a period. If one reads the poem through, carefully bringing out the contrasts and similarities above noted, he becomes aware of a curious sort of irony running through the lines, which is heightened by these phenomena.² V. 4 is repeated in 43. 5, thus serving to connect the two poems. But there also the line has a special effect. The first four lines of c. 43 give a rapid description of the abounding defects of the puella, followed by this scathing line, with the implication that such a puella is quite a

¹I follow the Teubner text. It is needless here to go into details as to the reading, Ameana. No one, I think, doubts that the meaningless a me an a of V represents a proper name, and it is clear that the termination, -iana, or -eana, or something very similar, is involved here, and this is sufficient for the present. Similarly, the reading of the last two lines, nec rogare, etc. is of no importance to the present discussion.

²As for vv. 4, 7, however, Radford, TAPA, XXXV, 45, n. 2, 3, would justify such divided pyrrhics in comedy "by the regular word-order." With v. 4, cf. also Fraenkel, op. cit., pp. 62 f.

fitting object for Mamurra to love. Here also the line ends a period, and its unusual rhythm fairly forces the reader, as it were, to pause to get the full flavour of what the poet has said.

In 45. 8, hoc ut dixit, Amor, sinistra ut ante, whatever the meaning of sinistra ut ante may be, it is clear that Amor is not the subject of dixit, and thus a sense-pause divides the pyrrhic. This is the only place where a sense-pause occurs in this position.¹ But here again, the unusual rhythm seems to serve a special purpose, emphasizing Amor, and making it almost equivalent to Amor ipse -- 'Twas none other than Love himself who sneezed them approval.'

It seems clear, then, that the verse requires (except for special purposes) that the two shorts of the pyrrhic sequence belong either to the same word, or to a word-group pronounced closely together. In this connection, Meyer's analysis² of the structure of this part of the verse is especially interesting. He concludes:

"Dagegen (i.e. in contrast with the Greeks) die römischen Dichter haben im Hendekasyllabus: 1) eine Cäsur (i.e. caesura of the verse) entweder nach dem Daktylus oder nach der folgenden Hebung als regelmässig beobachtet . . . ; 2) haben sie trochäisches Wortende im Daktylus nur unter der Bedingung zugelassen, dass die nach der nächsten Hebung folgende Cäsur diesen Einschnitt verhülle, insbesondere haben sie gemieden, diesen trochäischen Einschnitt durch eine Sinnespause auffällig zu machen."³

The second rule he states in simpler terms as follows:

"Sie lassen es (d. h. ein trochäisches Wort oder Wortende im Daktylus) nur zu, wenn ein jambisches Wort, d. h. Cäsur nach der 3. Hebung folgt."⁴

Thus Meyer sets up two apparently separate rules to govern but three adjacent syllables. There is, however, essentially but one rule, namely the first. For, since, as he maintains,⁵ a monosyllable may not stand before the 'caesura,' this part of the verse may be formed, according to rule 1), only of words ending in 0 0, giving 'caesura after the dactyl,' or in 0 -, giving 'caesura after the following rise'; and of all the types thus possible, only one, namely iambic words, could permit of 'a trochaic word-end in the dactyl.' Thus, the second rule is but a mechanical corollary of the first, and the essential of the theory, as Meyer's

¹If I am right in interpreting l. 9, as on p. 19, *supra*.

²"Cäsur im Hendekasyll.", *Sitzungsber. bayr. Akad.*, II (1889), 208 ff.

³*Ibid.*, p. 225.

⁴*Ibid.*, p. 215.

⁵*Ibid.*, p. 214.

whole argument is designed to show, is the first rule. If, however, the essential requirement is a 'caesura after the dactyl or after the following rise,' that is, at the fifth or sixth syllable of the line, then the combinations, - 0, 0 -; 0 - 0, 0 -; 0 0 - 0, 0 -; should not necessarily be avoided; rather, they should be expected with relative frequency, for they are mechanically possible only in this part of the line, and the types, - - 0 and 0 - - 0, unless thus admitted, cannot be used at all (except by elision, or in the case of the former, by lengthening of the ultima).¹ Actually, these combinations are quite as definitely avoided as any others which involve division of the pyrrhic.² Thus the rule of 'caesura' at the fifth or sixth syllable of the line scarcely accounts for all the facts.

As for the second rule, since it is essentially contained in the first, its raison d'être is not at once apparent. Moreover, it scarcely applies in fact. For of the 47 examples of 'trochaic word-ends in the dactyl,' that is, divided pyrrhics, discussed above, some 24 do not have iambic words as the second member. Meyer apparently excludes some of the above cases because of enclisis, but he does not give a list of passages, nor does he explicitly describe his method of count. On what basis he finds but 6, instead of about 24, exceptions to this rule in Catullus, and 35, instead of some 61, in Martial, is not clear. At any rate, with our present knowledge of enclisis and word-grouping, as we have seen above, almost all cases of divided pyrrhics might be similarly discounted, even those in which the second word is iambic.

But it is to be observed that the second rule implies the assumption that division of the pyrrhic sequence is objectionable per se; otherwise, why need it be 'verhüllt'? This assumption, which seems to be the real raison d'être for the second rule, and which is the very point at issue here, Meyer makes at various points in his article, without showing precisely how it is related to his main theory. His eagerness to find a 'caesura' leads to a curiously confused duality. If, however, the matter of verse-caesura be disregarded (as is now generally done in the case of hendecasyllabic and other short verses), and the 'assumption' just pointed out be taken as the fundamental, this of itself alone fully accounts for all the facts - - the great preponderance of undivided pyrrhics above discussed, the distribution of the various types of words in the pyrrhic sequence as explained in Chapter III, infra, the general avoidance of a sense-pause between the two

¹Cf. p. 23, infra.

²See chap. III, infra, on the distribution of these types.

shorts, and finally even the fact upon which Meyer's theory of 'caesura' chiefly rests, namely that there is usually a word-end at the fifth or sixth syllable of the verse; for, if division of the pyrrhic is to be avoided, this part of the line must usually be formed of types ending in 0 0 or 0 0 -, which incidentally give word-ends at the fifth or sixth syllable, whereas types which would not do so, being polysyllabic, are relatively rare, as for example, 0 0 - 0, 0 0 - 0 -, 0 0 - 0 - 0, - 0 0 - 0, - 0 0 - 0 -, and others. Further, as to the preponderance of iambic words as the second member of divided pyrrhics (for, whatever the basis of count, although by no means universal, in Catullus and Martial at least they are the commonest), this also arises from the law of the pyrrhic, since iambic enclitics are quite common, trisyllabic are rare, and monosyllabic, for the most part, long, as est, sum, sunt, and others.

Further Considerations

Some of the types which supply longer endings, as also some of those that give the two shorts together for the pyrrhic, are of such sort that they could not be used in any other way in hendecasyllabic verse. Thus, 0 - -, - 0 - -, and others, could not be used, except at the end of the verse; 0 0 -, - 0 0 -, and others could not be used except in such positions that they give the two shorts of the pyrrhic together. Doubtless some of these 'fixed' types normally occur in the language fairly frequently. Hence, it might be argued that the poet would need to use a considerable number of such words, and since in this kind of verse they must be placed in the positions above noted, it is naturally to be expected that in a large number of verses, the two shorts of the pyrrhic should belong to the same word, and that the verse should end with a longer word. Thus the 'principles of verse-structure' would arise simply from the poet's writing these parts of the line with such words as the language naturally supplies, and should be regarded as merely incidental to the fulfilment of the syllable sequence, rather than as essential to the verse.

That such is not the case, however, is clear from the following:

As for the pyrrhic sequence, if the verse did not require the two shorts to belong to the same word, this part of the line might be formed not only of the single verse-types, 0 0, 0 0 -, - 0 0, - 0 0 -, and others, but also of the following combinations:

Any one of:	0,	followed 0,
	- 0,	by 0 - ,
	0 - 0,	any one 0 - 0,
	0 0 - 0,	of: 0 - 0 -, etc.

That such combinations would naturally occur in a considerable number of instances, unless definitely avoided,¹ is obvious, for just as certain single types can be used only in this part of the line, so also such combinations can be used here only. In fact, whereas two of the commonest single types, 0 0 and - 0 0, can, by lengthening of the ultima, stand elsewhere in the line,² none of the combinations can. Moreover, certain word-types involved in these combinations, - - 0 and 0 - - 0, cannot be used except in such combinations (except by elision, and in the case of - - 0, by lengthening of the ultima). And it is curious that these two types used in such combinations occur only 6 and 10 times respectively, Table III, position 4; Table IV, position 1, but 0 0 - and - 0 0 -, which are equally fixed in position, occur 112 and 71 times respectively, Table III, position 7; Table IV, position 6.

Indeed, if it be argued that the two shorts of the pyrrhic sequence naturally belong to the same word in the great majority of instances, simply because many words of such types as 0 0 - and - 0 0 - are mechanically restricted to that position, one might almost as well argue that we should expect the two shorts to be frequently divided, because - - 0 and 0 - - 0 are restricted to such positions as necessitate division of the pyrrhic.

Again, if the structure of the pyrrhic were indifferent, the poet would surely avail himself of the mechanical advantage of the combinations above listed, for, if words of from one to three syllables only be considered, single types provide only three ways of building this part of the verse (0 0, 0 0 -, - 0 0), whereas combinations provide nine ways (any one of 0, - 0, 0 - 0, combined with any one of 0, 0 -, 0 - 0), and if longer words be included, the ratio of combinations to single types becomes still greater.

Thus it is clear that the infrequency of divided pyrrhics is not a mere incidental result of the fulfilment of the syllable sequence with whatever words, normally occurring in the language,

¹Not that the poet was consciously aware of any principles of verse-structure. Here and elsewhere, I by no means wish to imply that the poet deliberately sought out the phenomena under discussion. They arise simply because the rhythm is best maintained in certain ways and not others, and a poet's feeling for rhythm leads him, probably quite unconsciously, to follow certain 'rules.' Cf. White, Verse of Gr. Comedy (London, 1912), p. viii, "laws which they (the poets) unconsciously but unerringly obeyed."

²See infra, pp. 29, 31.

will fit, but is due to a definite need of the verse.

A similar consideration of the various mechanical possibilities at the end of the line would show that the occurrence of longer endings is not incidental, but also serves some purpose of the verse.

The question naturally arises whether or not other writers of hendecasyllabics follow the same practice as Catullus in these matters, and if so, what purpose such verse-structure serves. These are questions beyond the scope of, and unnecessary to, the present study, but certain facts and suggestions may be pointed out here.

As for other writers of hendecasyllabics, in Greek there are but the scantiest remains. Meyer¹ lists some 81, 54 of which, about 67 per cent, have longer endings; 63, about 78 per cent, have undivided pyrrhics. The number, however, is not large enough to permit of a conclusion, especially since quite a few of them are not kata stichon, and some are not Phalaecean.

In Latin there are some 5429 hendecasyllabics.² In those

¹Loc. cit., p. 210.

²CATULLUS has 527 (see p. 5, supra); PETRONIUS, 56 (15, 79, 93, 109, fr. 25, 29, Bücheler [6th ed. revised by Heraeus; Berlin: Weidmann, 1922], and Anth. Lat. 101, 102, 108, Bährens, Poet. Lat. Min. [Leipzig: Teubner, 1882], IV); PRIAPEA, 294, VARRO, 7 (Pr. 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 15, 17, 19, 23, 25, 26, 28, 29, 32, 34, 35, 37, 39, 41, 44-46, 48, 50, 52, 56, 57, 59, 61, 64, 66, 69, 70, 75-77; Men. fr. 49, 565-8, Bücheler, op. cit.); CINNA, 2, MAECENAS, 8, OVID, 2, AUGURINUS, 8, (fr. 9, 2, 5, 1, respectively, Bährens, Fragm. Poet. Lat. [2nd ed. revised by Morel; Leipzig: Teubner, 1927]); STATIUS, 455 (Silv. i. 6; ii. 7; iv. 3, 9, Phillimore [2nd ed.; Oxford, 1918]); MARTIAL, 2070 (see p. 6, n. 4, supra); SCRIPT. HIST. AUG. 15 (Vita Alex. Sev. 38, Claud. 10, Hohl [Leipzig: Teubner, 1927]); TERENCE, 57 (1945-47, 2545-61, 2565-81, 2583-86, 2589-98, 2600-05, Keil, Gram. Lat. [Leipzig: Teubner, 1874], VI); AUSONIUS, 65 (Ecl. 1, Griph. 10, Epist. 7, 14, 15, Incert. 4, Peiper [Leipzig: Teubner, 1886]); PRUDENTIUS, 264 (Cath. 4, Peris. 6, Dressel [Leipzig: Mendelssohn, 1860]); MARTIANUS, 44 (i. 24; ii. 119; ix. 915-6, Dick [Leipzig: Teubner, 1925]); SIDONIUS, 1234 (Epist. ii. 8, 10; iii. 12; iv. 11; viii. 9, 11; Carm. 9, 12-14, 23, 24, Mohr [Leipzig: Teubner, 1895]); ENNODIUS, 21, RURICIUS, 24, MEROBAUDES, 46 (Enn. 362, 388, 452; Rur. ii. 19; Mer. c. 4; Vogel, Krusch, Vollmer, in Mon. Germ. Hist. auct. antiq., VII, VIII, XIV, [Berlin: Weidmann, 1885, 1887, 1905]); BOETHIUS, 37 (Cons. i. c. 4; iii. 4, 10; iv. 4, Peiper [Leipzig: Teubner, 1871]); TIBERIANUS,

authors of whose works we have remains sufficient to judge of their individual practice, the verse-structure is quite constant: Martial (2070 verses), Sidonius (1234), and Catullus (527), have longer endings, respectively about 69, 67 and 69 per cent; undivided pyrrhics about 91 per cent each. In the remaining 1598 verses of various authors, longer endings occur about 56 per cent, undivided pyrrhics, about 92 per cent. Of the total 5429, about 65 per cent (considerably more, if final enclitics be excepted) have longer endings, about 92 per cent have undivided pyrrhics. Thus the non-division of the pyrrhic may fairly be regarded as a definite rule, the use of longer endings, as a general tendency.

Why these phenomena should obtain is a question involving the theory of the verse. If the verse is indeed a logaoedic pentameter,¹ it may be that the non-division of the pyrrhic effects a shortening in time in the second foot. The first foot is usually a spondee, that is, 4/4 time; the last three, trochaic, that is, 3/4 time. The second foot, then, may form a transition from one to the other, being neither full 4/4, nor yet quite as short as 3/4. The long of the dactyl could scarcely be shortened, since it bears the ictus; hence a shortening might be effected by keeping the two shorts as close together as possible in utterance.² We have seen that, by contrast with his practice in hendecasyllabics, Catullus freely divides pyrrhics in verses in 4/4 time, but it is curious that in 'logaoedic' verses, other than hendecasyllabics, he also has divided pyrrhics fairly commonly.³ Again, in comedy, dactyls occurring in trochaic rhythms regularly have the pyrrhic sequence undivided, and it is generally agreed that this serves the purpose of shortening the time of such feet.⁴ In comedy, however, such dactyls are merely sporadic substitutions, whereas the dactyl in hendecasyllabics is an essential of the verse.

12 (C. 3, Bährens, Poet. Min. III, supra cit.); SENECA, 30, ALCIMUS, 4, VOMANIUS, 25, LINDIMUS, 12, INCERTUS, 6, LUXORIUS, 104 (Anth. Lat. 54, 55, 70; 116; 152; 217; 318; 441, 451, 455, 456, 461, 471, 486, 490, 509, 526, Bährens, supra cit.).

¹See supra, p. 3, n. 2.

²On the time value of 'logaoedic' or 'cyclic' dactyls, see White, op. cit., pp. 168 f., and bibliography there cited, especially Goodell, Greek Metric (New York, 1901), pp. 240 f.

³See supra, p. 15.

⁴Lindsay, Early Lat. Verse, pp. 80, 86, et alib. Cf. however, Drexler, op. cit., I, 10, n. 2. For details, see Maurenbrecher, Hiatus (Leipzig, 1899), pp. 25 f. and Leo, Plaut. Forsch. (2nd ed.; Berlin, 1912), pp. 261 f.

Further, on the basis of the logaoedic theory, there appears to be a relationship between the non-division of the pyrrhic and the tendency to use longer endings. There are four possible

I II III IV

diaereses: $\Theta \Theta / - O O / - O / - O / - \Theta$. The non-division of the pyrrhic frequently results in the formation of the second foot with types beginning with - O O, or ending with O O, which necessitate diaereses I or II or both. It may be that the necessary frequency of these diaereses is to be compensated for in general by avoidance of III and IV. Now, various combinations with monosyllabic endings would avoid one or other or both of these, but final monosyllables seem to be per se objectionable, being regularly avoided in the best Latin poetry. Dissyllabic endings always require diaeresis IV, and two of the combinations possible with them, namely - O, - Θ and -, O, - Θ , require III also, whereas longer endings and their combinations all avoid IV, and, except in the case of - O - Θ and -, O - Θ , also avoid III. Hence, if diaereses III and IV are to be avoided by way of compensation for the frequency of I and II, due to the non-division of the pyrrhic, longer endings and their combinations must frequently be used. If this be right, it is clear why the use of longer endings is a tendency rather than a definite rule, for the avoidance of diaeresis is not an absolute requirement. These theoretical considerations are curiously reflected in Catullus. Diaereses I and II occur 311 and 293 times respectively, involving in the great majority of cases, types beginning with - O O or ending with O O, but diaereses III and IV occur only half as frequently, 140 and 152 times respectively, the comparative infrequency of them being largely due to the use of longer endings or combinations with them.¹

But the 'new metric' abandons the logaoedic scansion of Phalaecean hendecasyllabic and other Aeolic verses. According to the new theory, the Phalaecean is a trimeter.² On this basis, the verse-structure above discussed seems to have no obvious explanation, for the first and second metrons are regularly welded closely together by the non-division of the pyrrhic, whereas the second and third are separated in a great number of verses by the use of trisyllabic endings.

¹It is also to be observed that, on the basis of the logaoedic theory, there is wide-spread coincidence of accent and ictus, if allowance be made for sentence enclisis.

²See supra, p. 3, n. 2.

CHAPTER III

WORD-TYPES AND THEIR POSITIONS IN THE VERSE

It has been shown in Chapter II, that hendecasyllabic verse, as written by Catullus, requires that the verse end with words of at least two syllables in length, preferably with those of three or more, and that the two shorts of the pyrrhic, as a general rule, belong to the same word. Because of these principles of verse-structure: 1) certain word-types, which fulfill these two conditions, occur with disproportionate frequency; 2) certain word-types, though having sequences possible in several places in the verse, are restricted for the most part to but one of their possible positions. To illustrate this, we shall consider each word-type separately with respect to its positions in the verse and the frequency of its occurrence.

First, however, as regards relative frequency, it must be pointed out that longer word-types should in any case be expected to occur less frequently than shorter ones. Most of the words commonly needed in the language are of the shorter types. Moreover, the longer the word, the more is it likely to be restricted in position; hence it cannot be easily shifted relative to other words, and is thus more difficult to work into a phrase. Besides, many longer words are impossible in the verse because of their metrical form,¹ and the number of longer words that might occur is thus further reduced. Hence, in estimating the relative frequency of a given word-type, the number of its occurrences is compared with that of other types of equal length.

¹All words of from one to three syllables of whatever form are admissible in hendecasyllabics (except words of the form, 0 0 0, ending in a vowel, which can be got into the verse only by elision), but of the sixteen different possible types of four-syllable words, four types, 0 - - -, 0 0 0 -, 0 0 0 0, 0 - - 0, cannot be accommodated at all (except 0 - - 0, by admission of iambic verse-beginning and division of the pyrrhic), five others, - - - -, - - 0 -, - 0 0 0, 0 0 - -, 0 - 0 0, are possible only by elision or lengthening of the ultima, and some of these would require abnormal verse-structure. If still longer words are considered, a still greater number of types will be found to be impossible in hendecasyllabics.

In the following, instances of elision are left out of consideration. Catullus freely admits elision, and by it many more positions are possible for various word-types, but although there is a goodly number of elisions, consideration of them would not appreciably affect the conclusions drawn, and would needlessly complicate the discussion.

In some few cases, the verse begins with, - 0 or 0 -, instead of the usual, - -. These exceptions are referred to as 'anomalous trochees or iambs.' It is evident that Catullus scarcely regarded them with favour, for he has relatively few of them,¹ and the types that would form such sequences are usually placed elsewhere in the verse. To illustrate this latter point, it has seemed worth while to consider instances of this sort in the following.

The monosyllabic word-type, 0, as the verse-type, 0, or -, has thirteen possibilities, Table I, column I. Positions 2, 4, forming the anomalous iamb or trochee, occur only 5 times and once respectively. Positions 6, 7, giving division of the pyrrhic, occur only 4 and 8 times respectively. Position 12 requires a monosyllable to complete the verse, and occurs but once. Position 13 would itself be a monosyllabic ending, and does not occur. The other possible positions, therefore, are preferred, and all are fairly frequently represented.

The word-type, -, has seven possibilities, Table I, column II. Position 12 requires a monosyllable to complete the verse, and occurs but once. Position 14 is itself a monosyllabic ending; it occurs 15 times, but see supra, p. 13. None of the other positions offend against the verse-structure, and all occur relatively frequently.

The dissyllabic word-type, 0 0, has six possible positions, Table II, column I. Positions 3, 5, giving the anomalous iamb or trochee, occur only 10 and 3 times, respectively. Position 8, giving division of the pyrrhic, occurs only 13 times. Position 12, requiring a monosyllable to complete the verse, occurs only 3 times. Position 7, however, giving the two shorts of the pyrrhic together, occurs 137 times,—more than all the others together. It is to be noted that this is the only dissyllabic word-type especially useful to the verse-structure, and it has the largest number of occurrences in one position of all dissyllabic types. It might be thought that it is but natural that pyrrhic words

¹Some 31 instances of the former, 39 of the latter. It is usually held that in this matter Catullus was following Greek technique. Later writers of hendecasyllabics regularly avoid the practice; cf. Münscher, "Metr. Beiträge," Hermes, LVI (1921), 74; Giarratano, De Marcialis re metr. (Naples, 1908), p. 49.

should fall thus frequently in the pyrrhic sequence. It must be remembered, however, that most words with a short ultima end with a consonant, and thus in most cases words of the form, 0 0, are potentially either pyrrhic or iambic. Frequently, moreover, the final consonant is -m, in which case, a pyrrhic word cannot stand as a pyrrhic within the verse, for if the next word begins with a consonant, it becomes iambic, if with a vowel, it elides. And it is further to be noted that even many of the pyrrhic words here used which end in a vowel are potentially iambic, as mihi, tibi, etc.¹ Thus the obvious conclusion that pyrrhic word-types 'just naturally' fall in the great majority of instances in this one position is not necessarily valid, especially when there are several other positions in which most such words could stand equally well as the verse-type, 0 -. The only position not yet mentioned is 10, in which this type does not offend against the verse-structure: it has 57 instances, a relatively small number compared with 137 instances in position 7; but, with those in position 10, compare the remarks following on iambic words.

The word-type, 0 -, has five possible positions, Table II, column II. Positions 3, 5, involving the anomalous iamb or trochee, occur but 5 and 4 times, respectively. Position 8, involving division of the pyrrhic occurs only 10 times. Position 12, requiring a monosyllable to complete the verse, does not occur at all. The only remaining position, therefore, 10, has 97 instances, the large majority of the total. Thus the position of iambic words, because of the two principles of verse-structure, is almost as definitely fixed as if the line had but one iambic sequence.

The word-type, - 0, has seven possible positions, Table II, column III. Position 2, involving the anomalous trochee, has only 11 instances; position 6, involving division of the pyrrhic, only 17. The others do not offend against the verse-structure and are all fairly well represented, except position 11, which has only 17 instances.²

The word-type, - -, has only three possible positions, none of which seriously offends against the verse-structure, and all are fairly frequently represented, Table II, column IV.

¹Cf. infra, p. 60.

²This seems best explained as due to the fact that the verse ends with two dissyllabic words in such cases. Thus if the pentameter theory of the verse be right (see supra, p. 3, n. 2), the word-type, - 0, in position 11, makes diaeresis both between the third and fourth, and between the fourth and fifth feet. Cf. supra, pp. 26 f.

The trisyllabic word-types, 0 0 0, and 0 0 -, have but one possible position, Table III, columns I, II. Together they give the verse-type, 0 0 -, 111 times, position 7, supplying the two shorts for the pyrrhic sequence,—an especially useful verse-type, as is evidenced by the large number of occurrences, second in frequency only to the type, 0 - -, at the end of the verse, position 13.

The word-type, 0 - 0, has five possible positions, Table III, column III. Position 3, involving the anomalous iamb, occurs only 5 times; position 5, involving the anomalous trochee, does not occur at all. Position 8, with division of the pyrrhic, occurs only 6 times. Position 10, which does not offend against the verse-structure, occurs 77 times, but position 12, providing a trisyllabic ending, occurs 108 times. Thus this type is most frequent in this last position, where it especially serves the needs of the verse-structure, occurring 108 times in this one position, whereas, for example, the type, - - 0, occurs only 32 times altogether, column VII.

The word-type, 0 - -, has two possible positions, Table III, column IV. Position 3, giving the anomalous iamb, occurs only 5 times. Position 13 provides a trisyllabic ending and occurs 123 times, the largest trisyllabic group. Thus the types, 0 - 0, and 0 - -, occur together at the end of the verse 231 times, over 34 per cent of all instances of trisyllabic verse-types.

The word-type, - 0 0, has four possible positions, Table III, column V. Position 2, giving the anomalous trochee, occurs but once; position 11, requiring a monosyllable to complete the verse, not at all. Position 9 occurs 20 times, but position 6, providing the two shorts of the pyrrhic, occurs 81 times, the great majority of the total number of instances. Here again, it must be borne in mind that a dactylic word is in most cases potentially either dactylic or cretic in verse.¹ If it seem that the word-type, - 0 0, 'just naturally' falls in position 6, one has only to compare the word-type, - - 0, column VII, to show that so hasty a conclusion is invalid. Observe that the word-type, - - 0, occurs as the verse-type, - - -, 26 times, but only 6 times in its 'natural' form, - - 0, that is, about 19 per cent of its instances, whereas the word-type, - 0 0, occurs in its 'natural' form about 80 per cent, and this, despite the fact that the word-type, - 0 0, may have its 'natural' form in only one of its four positions, whereas the word-type, - - 0, may have its 'natural' form in one out of two possible positions.

¹Cf. supra, p. 29, on the word-type, 0 0.

The word-type, - 0 -, has three possible positions, Table III, column VI. Position 2, giving the anomalous trochee, occurs but 6 times. Position 11 requires a monosyllable to complete the verse, and occurs but once. The remaining position, 9, therefore, has the great majority of instances, namely 26. Thus this type is almost as fixed in position by the verse-structure, as if there were but one cretic sequence in the line. It is to be observed that this type of word is not especially useful in the verse as providing the pyrrhic sequence, or a longer ending, and its total number is only 33, whereas, for example, the type, 0 - -, giving a longer ending, occurs 123 times, column IV, position 13, and 00 -, giving the pyrrhic, occurs 71 times, column II, position 7.

The word-type, - - 0, has but two possible positions, Table III, column VII. Its 'natural' position, 4, involves division of the pyrrhic, and has only 6 instances, but position 1, which does not offend against the verse-structure, has 26.¹ The word-type, - - 0, then, as a general rule, may be used in only one of its two possible positions because of the verse-structure. As for frequency, it is the least frequent of all trisyllabic types, for one of its positions requires division of the pyrrhic, the other has no peculiar advantage to the verse-structure.

The word-type, - - -, has but one possible position, Table III, column VIII. It is just about as infrequent as the type, - - 0, having but 33 instances. This type is likewise not especially useful. It is curious to compare, for example, the type, 0 0 -, column II, which also has but one possible position, but occurs more than twice as often, giving the pyrrhic.

The four-syllable word-type, 0 0 - 0, has but one possible position, and there are but 7 instances, Table IV, column I, position 7. This is the only four-syllable word-type suitable for the pyrrhic sequence that is of relatively rare occurrence (except 0 - 0 0, which requires the anomalous trochee).

The word-type, 0 - 0 0, has three possible positions, Table IV, column II. But position 5 gives the anomalous trochee, and does not occur. Position 8, involving division of the pyrrhic, occurs but once. Position 10 requires a monosyllable to end the verse, and does not occur. So, also, the word-type, 0 - 0 -, which is metrically possible in the last two of these positions, does not occur at all. These facts well illustrate how verse-structure eliminates the use of certain words that are 'metrically' possible.

The word-types, - 0 0 0, and - 0 0 -, have but one possible position, Table IV, columns III, IV, position 6. Together

¹Cf. supra, p. 31, on the word-type, - 0 0.

they give the verse-type, - 0 0 -, 70 times. The usefulness of the type is evidenced by the large number of occurrences. Only at the end of the verse, positions 11, 12, is there an equally large group of four-syllable verse-types.

The word-type, - 0 - 0, has three possible positions, Table IV, column V. Position 2 gives the anomalous trochee, and occurs but twice. Position 9 has 29 instances, but position 11 has 49, giving the preferred long ending.

The word-type, - 0 - -, has but one possible position, Table IV, column VI, and occurs, giving the long ending, 22 times. Thus, together with the type, - 0 - 0, position 11, there are 71 instances of four-syllable types at the end of the verse, over 34 per cent of the total number of four-syllable types.

The word-type, - - 0 0, has but one possible position, Table IV, column VII, position 4. It occurs 14 times, giving the pyrrhic sequence.

The word-type, - - - 0, has but one possible position, Table IV, column VIII, position 1. This type, which requires division of the pyrrhic, occurs only 8 times, whereas the types, - 0 0 0, - 0 0 -, which are equally restricted in position, occur 23 and 47 times respectively, columns III, IV. The type, 0 - - 0, Table IV, position 3, which, by admission of the anomalous iamb, might stand in the same position as - - - 0, dividing the pyrrhic, does not occur at all.

Five- and six-syllable word-types, Tables V, VI, comprise but a very small proportion of the vocabulary used. Practically all of them have but one possible position, and all are relatively rare. Among five-syllable types, the only one that requires division of the pyrrhic, 0 - 0 - 0, Table V, position 8, does not occur, but this same type occurs giving long endings 31 times, position 10. It is to be noted that the types, 0 - 0 - 0, positions 10, 11, forming long endings, occur together 42 times, over 71 per cent of all instances of five-syllable types. Similarly, among those of six syllables, the striking fact is that the only types occurring at all frequently are - 0 - 0 - 0, forming longer endings 18 times, Table VI, positions 7, 8, thus comprising about 86 per cent of all six-syllable types, there being but 3 other instances.

It is clear, then, that the number of occurrences of each type of word, and the positions in the verse occupied by them, are determined to a large extent by the two principles of verse-structure, enunciated above, and that certain types of words for certain positions in the verse are especially needed in composing this kind of verse.

CHAPTER IV

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN VERSE-STRUCTURE AND DICTION: THE END OF THE VERSE

From the last two chapters, it is clear that in composing hendecasyllabic verse, two kinds of words were particularly needed by Catullus, namely: 1) words of three or more syllables ending with a trochaic (or spondaic) sequence, for the end of the verse; 2) words containing two successive short syllables, for the pyrrhic sequence. We may now turn to examine what features of the language were found especially useful in supplying these.

At the end of the verse, a great number of the words which give longer endings fall into one or other of the following categories: diminutive nouns and adjectives in -llus, -lla, -llum, abstract nouns in -tio, -tionis, adjectives (and adverbs) in -osus, -a, -um, masculine abstract nouns in -or, -oris, comparatives in -ior, -ioris, genitive plurals in -orum and -arum. In the 527 lines which form the basis of the present study, words belonging to one or other of these six categories supply longer endings for about one in four verses.

Diminutive Nouns and Adjectives in -llus, -lla, -llum

The following lines end with diminutive nouns and adjectives in -llus, -lla, -llum:¹

Forming the dissyllabic ending, - O: bellam, 43. 6;

Forming trisyllabic endings, O - O: libellum, 1. 1;
libelli, 1. 8; puellae, 2. 1, 11; 3. 3, 17; ocelli, 3. 18; Catullo,²

¹Under this head, are here included words which are of diminutive formation, whether or not they had any diminutive meaning in Catullus' time. For cases in which diminutive derivation is not obvious, or is doubtful, reference to authorities is given. The pronominal adjectives, ullus and nullus, are not included.

²Stolz, Hist. Grammat. (Leipzig, 1894), I, 575, 582; Paucker, "Deminutive mit doppeltem l," KZ, XXIII (1877), 180; Corssen, Ausspr. Vokal. und Beton. (Leipzig, 1870), II, 149; Schwabe, De deminutivis (Giessen, 1859), p. 36.

6. 1; Catullost, 7. 10; puellae, 10. 16, 27; Fabullus,¹ 12. 15; Fabullum, 12. 17; puella, 13. 4; Catulli, 13. 7; puellae, 13. 11; libellum, 14. 12; Catullum, 14. 13; salillost, 23. 19; lapillis, 23. 21; Fabulle, 28. 3; lucelli, 28. 6; lucello, 28. 8; tabellam, 32. 5; puella, 35. 8; misellae, 35. 14; medullam,² 35. 15; puella, 35. 16; 36. 2; Catullo, 38. 1; ocellis, 43. 2; ocellos, 45. 11; medullis, 45. 16; Fabullo, 47. 3; Catullus, 49. 4; tabellis, 50. 2; ocellos, 50. 10; ocelle, 50. 19; pusillum, 54. 1; libellis, 55. 4; puellae, 55. 10; papillis, 55. 12; puellae, 55. 17; Catullum, 56. 3; puellae, 56. 5; medullis, 58b. 8;

Forming quadrisyllabic endings, - o - o: integellum, 15.4; Ipsitilla,³ 32. 1; codicillos, 42. 11, 12, 24; Septimille, 45. 13.

Thus, of 527 hendecasyllabics, 53 end with such diminutive forms. There are also 3 instances in rejected lines,⁴ puellae, 3. 4; codicillos, 42. 19, 20, making the total 56.⁵ There are, all told, about 159 instances of such words in Catullus. Thus over one-third of the instances stand in this one position in this one kind of verse, all but one forming the preferred longer endings.

In other positions in hendecasyllabics, there are 24 instances, 6 of which are dissyllabic, and 3 others elided, forming dissyllabic verse-types: puella, 3. 7; bella, 3. 14; bellum, 3. 15; miselle, 3. 16; scortill(um), 10. 3; Catulle, 10. 25; Fabull(e), 13. 1; Fabulle, 13. 14; Salla,⁶ 14. 9; bellus, 24. 7; bello, 24. 8; puella, 36. 9; miselle, 40. 1; puella, 41. 1, 3, 5, 7; 43. 1; bello, 43. 2; misellus, 45. 21; Catulle, 46. 4; femellas, 55. 7; gemell(i), 57. 6; Catullus, 58. 2.

In other kinds of verse, such words are proportionately much less frequent, there being but 79 instances,⁷ and for the

¹Paucker, loc. cit., p. 185.

²Stolz, op. cit., I, 584; Paucker, loc. cit., p. 175; cf. Walde, Lat. etym. Wörterbuch (Heidelberg, 1910), and Ernout-Meillet, Dict. étym. (Paris, 1932), s. v.

³Possibly diminutive of ipsa, in sense of domina (cf. Cat. 3. 7); Bücheler, Petronius (Berlin, 1862), note on ipsimi, 63. Cf. however, Kroll, Ellis ad loc.

⁴See p. 5, supra.

⁵Martial also uses such diminutive forms in hendecasyllabics, giving longer endings, trisyllabic in most cases. In 2070 lines, he has about 160 instances, including proper names, and a few words the diminutive origin of which is problematical.

⁶Paucker, loc. cit., p. 169.

⁷Gemelle, 4. 27 bis; Catulle, 8. 1; puella, 8. 4, 7, 12; Catullus, 8. 12; bella, 8. 16; labella, 8. 18; Catulle, 8. 19;

most part, they are scattered in various positions in the different kinds of verse.¹

Thus, half the instances of such words in Catullus occur in hendecasyllabics, and of these more than two-thirds stand at the end of the verse, giving the longer endings needed by the verse-structure.

That it is the metrical form of such words that partly² determines the recurrence of them seems indicated also by the fact that some are rare in the diminutive form, and Catullus has the simple forms himself elsewhere. Integellus occurs but once elsewhere in Latin (Cic. Ad fam. ix. 10. 2), and there with a different

Catulli, 11. 1; puellae, 11. 15; puella, 17. 14, 15; bellus, 22. 9; capillo, 25. 1 (Paucker, loc. cit., p. 183); auricilla, 25. 2; mollicellas, 25. 10; flagella, 25. 11; ocelle, 31. 2; puellae, 34. 2, 4; puellarum, 37. 4; puella, 37. 11; pusilli, 37. 16; Catullum, 44. 3; villa, 44. 7 (Paucker, loc. cit., p. 184; cf. Ernout-Meillet, op. cit., s. v. vicius); Catulle, 51. 13; 52. 1; sella, 52. 2 (Müller, De ling. Lat. deminutivis [Leipzig, 1865], p. 9; cf. Ernout-Meillet, op. cit., s. v. sedeo); Catulle, 52. 4; papillis, 61. 105; labello, 61. 220; puellam, 62. 23; puellae, 62. 42, 44; puellis, 62. 47; flagellum, 62. 52; corollis, 63. 66; labellis, 63. 74; ocellis, 64. 60; papillas, 64. 65; medullis, 64. 93; puellam, 64. 97; labello, 64. 104; capillo, 64. 193; medullis, 64. 196; corollis, 64. 283; labellis, 64. 316; puellae, 64. 379; stellarum, 66. 2 (Stolz, op. cit., I, 581; Paucker, loc. cit., p. 177; cf. Ernout-Meillet, op. cit., s. v.) medullas, 66. 23; papillas, 66. 81; tigillo, 67. 39; ancillis, 67. 42; Catullo, 68. 27; medullis, 68. 111; Catullo, 68. 135; bella, 69. 8; puella, 69. 8; Catullum, 72. 1; Catulle, 76. 5; bellus, 78. 3; bello, 78. 4; bella, 78. 4; puella, 78. 4; Catulle, 79. 2; Catullum, 79. 3; labella, 80. 1; miselli, 80. 7; bellus, 81. 2; Catullum, 82. 1; puellis, 89. 3; olla, 94. 2 (Müller, op. cit., p. 9); tantillum, 99. 6; labella, 99. 7; medullas, 100. 7; fureillis, 105. 2; bello, 106. 1.

¹In hexameters, however, there are some 30 instances at the end of the line (those underlined in n. 7, supra), but even so the number at the end of the line in hendecasyllabics, is greater in the gross, and much greater proportionately, for there are but 552 hendecasyllabic lines altogether, whereas there are 795 hexameters.

²Various factors, of course, are at work in determining a poet's usage, meaning, style, poetic effect, assonance, etc. etc. Here, and elsewhere, I by no means wish to imply that metrical convenience is the sole, or even necessarily the most important.

meaning. Ipsitilla, if indeed it be a diminutive,¹ is found here only. Lapillus, though fairly common after Catullus, was probably coined by him,² and he has the simplex, lapis, 3 times elsewhere. Libellus is common in general, but except at the end of hendecasyllabic verses, Catullus himself uses liber. Lucellum is relatively rare, though it occurs in Cicero, Horace, and Seneca.³ Misellus occurs but rarely outside of Catullus,⁴ and he himself has miser 31 times. Salillum occurs but once elsewhere.⁵ Septimillus occurs only in Catullus.

Another indication that the use of these words is partly determined by the form of them, consists in the fact that in some cases, there seems to be but little difference in connotation between the diminutive form and the simplex. Some of the above listed words had doubtless lost any distinctive diminutive meaning,⁶ since they had replaced the simplex, or had developed a meaning different from that of the simplex, as for example, bellus, codicilli,⁷ papilla,⁸ puella, pusillus.⁹ In other cases, however, some definite diminutive connotation is to be expected, but, though in some cases this can clearly be made out, comparison with other passages makes it rather dubious. A curious example is the word, ocellus, which Catullus has altogether 7 times. He has the simplex, oculus, 15 times. Comparison of some of the passages in which these words occur will serve to illustrate the point at issue here.

Ocelli, 3. 18, used of Lesbia's eyes, doubtless heightens the effect of playful affection,¹⁰ especially since it is accompanied by the diminutive adjective, turgiduli, but Catullus uses the simplex in addressing Juventius, 48. 1, in equally affectionate tones. Again, contrast ocellos, 45. 11 with oculos, 9. 9. In the

¹Cf. p. 35, n. 3, *supra*.

²De Labriolle, "L'emploi du dim. chez Cat.," *Rev. de Phil.*, XXIX (1905), 278.

³Cf. Platner, "Diminutives in Cat.," *AJP*, XVI (1895), 196.

⁴Platner, *ibid.*, p. 188.

⁵Plautus *Trin.* 492, and there the reading is disputed.

⁶On this phenomenon in general, see Friedrich, *Demin.-bild. mit nicht demin. Bedeut.* (Leipzig, 1916).

⁷Cf. de Labriolle, *loc. cit.*, p. 280, n. 3.

⁸Cf. Gow, "Diminutives in Aug. Poetry," *CQ*, XXVI (1932), 153; de Labriolle, Platner, *loc. cit.*, pp. 280, 198.

⁹Cf. de Labriolle, Platner, *loc. cit.*, pp. 280, 189.

¹⁰Cf. Platner, *loc. cit.*, p. 197; Ellis, Merrill, *ad loc.*

former Catullus speaks of Acme kissing Septimius' eyes, and the diminutive may be thought to suggest her love for him, but the passage is merely narrative: on the other hand, in 9. 9, Catullus is directly addressing his friend, Veranius, with a warmth of affection, but he uses the simplex, though he does not shrink from using the diminutive form of his friend's name by way of displaying affection, 12. 17; 47. 3. Again, in 50. 10, he uses the diminutive of his own eyes in a narrative passage where that form can have but little force, except perhaps to invite pity; then, only nine lines further on, he uses the same word (in the same position in the line, be it noted) as an affectionate address to his friend, Licinius. It seems, then, that so far as meaning or feeling is concerned, there is a certain inconsistency in Catullus' use of ocellus, as distinct from oculus, and the force of the diminutive is little different in some cases from that of the simplex as used elsewhere. On the other hand, it seems likely that the metrical form of the two words has considerable to do with determining which is used.¹ Ocellus occurs 5 times at the end of hendecasyllabic verses, giving a trisyllabic ending; elsewhere only twice, once at the end of hexameter, 64. 60, where also such words are especially useful,² and once in choliambic verse, 31. 2, a meter in which oculus is impossible.³ Elsewhere, oculus is used, and it too is especially convenient metrically in most of the passages in which it occurs. It is used 4 times in hendecasyllabic verse, providing unbroken pyrrhics;⁴ twice in Galliambic verse, filling out the difficult sequence of shorts at the end of the line, 63. 39, 48; once at the beginning of the third foot in Galliambics, 63. 37, for which, because of the regular diaeresis, words of the form, 0 0 -, are much needed; the other cases of the word supply dactyls in hexameters and elegiacs, and half of them serve to end pentameters, 65. 8; 82. 2, 4; 104. 2; the others are

¹Cf. Gow, loc. cit., p. 155, n. 2.

²See p. 36, n. 1, supra.

³De Labriolle, loc. cit., p. 280, says that in 31. 2, because of his happiness upon his return to Sirmio, Catullus "préfère Ocelle à Ocule qui, au point de vue du sens général, eût été également admissible," and points out that Cicero uses oculos in much the same way of Corinth and Carthage (De nat. deor. iii. 38. 91). Granting, however, that ocule could be used in the sense here required, and granting too, that Catullus liked the effect of the diminutive better, it is idle to speak of any preference in the matter, for oculus in any form cannot be got into choliambics.

⁴See p. 64, infra.

in 64. 17; 82. 1, 4; 108. 5.

The connotation of other diminutives used at the end of hendecasyllabics we shall dismiss briefly. *Integellum*, 15. 4, differs but slightly, if at all, in connotation from *integri*, 34. 2. It is especially difficult to discover any very distinctive force in the diminutive, since it modifies not *puerum*, but the general impersonal, *quicquam*; moreover, it balances *castum*, which is not diminutive, and to which it adds but little in meaning.¹ Similarly, *lapillis*, 23. 21, is used for stone in general as something hard; the diminutive is apparently unparalleled in this sense, and the meaning is such that the diminutive form can scarcely modify it in any very precise way. By contrast, Catullus has the simplex, *lapidis*, 69. 4, in precisely the sense in which the diminutive is quite common, namely, 'jewel.'² *Libellum*, 1. 1, and *libelli*, 1. 8, is used with reference to the poet's own book of poetry, but the diminutive force is matter of some doubt, since *libellus* and *liber* are used interchangeably in this sense.³ *Libellum*, 14. 12, is used not of a book of one poet's work, but of a collection. Here the diminutive force can hardly be pressed, for Catullus speaks of the book as being written by *tot poetis*, v. 5, who are *tantum impiorum*, v. 7, - - language that scarcely implies a little book, nor does any other of the usual connotations of the diminutive seem quite appropriate, unless it be contempt. *Libellis*, 55. 4, seems to be used in the sense of 'book-shops,'⁴ a meaning unparalleled for either diminutive or simplex. Any diminutive connotation seems in any case to be out of the question.⁵ *Lucelli*, 28. 6, probably suggests 'even a tiny little bit of gain,' the idea of pettiness being further emphasized by the indefinite, *ecquidnam*. Cicero also has the diminutive with a

¹Cf. Platner, *loc. cit.*, p. 187.

²Cf. Harpers' *Latin Dict.*, s. v. *lapillus*.

³Gow, *loc. cit.*, p. 155, n. 1; cf. Ferrari, "Uso dei diminutivi in Cat." *Athenaeum*, III (1915), 449; Birt, *Buchwesen* (Berlin, 1882), pp. 22, 405f. Under the circumstances, it seems hardly justifiable to press the diminutive force of *libellus* here in the question of the form of the publication of Catullus' work. Cf. Wheeler, *Catullus and the Traditions* (Berkeley, 1934), p. 54.

⁴*Ellis*, *ad loc.*, suggests 'placards,' but in *libellis*, as meaning 'among the placards,' is a bit strained, and the reference is very vague as compared with the other places specifically mentioned in the passage, to say nothing of the rather odd use of *in*.

⁵We shall see, p. 54, *infra*, that Catullus elsewhere had difficulty in expressing 'book-shops' in this kind of verse.

somewhat similar connotation (Verr. iii. 30. 71; 44. 106). But lucello, 28. 8, is used not in the general sense of gain, as in v. 6, but as a technical book-keeping term, in which any diminutive force is difficult to see.¹ Misellae, 35. 14, seems to have but little difference in connotation from that of miser in various other passages in Catullus.² Tabellam, 32. 5, is a little obscure, but if, as is generally agreed, it means 'door-panel,' none of the usual connotations of the diminutive seems quite in order. Again, in 50. 2, no especial diminutive force seems quite applicable to the word, unless it be to suggest a sort of affection for his tablets.³ Various other considerations might be adduced to show that the diminutive forms in some of the passages here in question differ but little in connotation from the simplex forms, but it would be tedious and of little profit to prolong the discussion, since it is almost impossible to establish any very objective methods of analysis.

A word on the use of the proper name, Catullus. One of the features of the poet's style is his frequent reference to himself by name in the third person. This occurs some 15 times in his work.⁴ So far as meaning is concerned, the name in these cases is virtually equivalent of the first personal pronoun. Indeed, this impersonal method of expression is frequently either preceded or followed by the personal. For example, in c. 6, the impersonal Catullo, v. 1, is followed by the personal, dic nobis; volo, v. 16. In 7 of the 15 instances⁵ of this usage, the name occurs at the end of hendecasyllabic verses.⁶

To sum up: words of diminutive form in -llus, -lla, -llum, are proportionately much more frequent at the end of hendecasyllabic verse than anywhere else in Catullus. Since such words provide verse-types which are especially needed for this position, and the meaning could, and in some cases normally would, be

¹Cf. Platner, loc. cit., p. 196.

²Platner, ibid., p. 188.

³Gow, loc. cit., p. 153, n. 3.

⁴Catullus' name occurs altogether 25 times. In 10. 25, and possibly in 68. 27, it is in quotation. In 8 instances, 8. 1, 19; 46. 4; 51. 13; 52. 1, 4; 76. 5; 79. 2, he addresses himself by name, a usage rather different from the impersonal use here discussed. Cf. Kroll on 8. 1; 6. 1.

⁵Listed, pp. 34 f. supra.

⁶There is but one other instance in hendecasyllabics, 58. 2. Four occur at the end of hexameter lines, 68. 135; 72. 1; 79. 3; 82. 1; the others are in 8. 12; 11. 1; 44. 3.

expressed by words of a different metrical form, it seems clear that in general the convenient metrical form of such words partly determines the recurrence of them.

That the meter is a factor in determining the use of diminutives in Catullus has been recognized by various previous writers.¹ Others again deprecate such a suggestion as being a reflection on the artistic skill of the poet, and by emphasizing the stylistic value of diminutives in Catullus, try to belittle the importance of the metrical factor.² The argument, if such it may be called, is simply a difference of emphasis, and all the evidence on either side does not disprove the validity of that on the other. There is nothing necessarily 'compromising for Catullus' art'³ in the theory that the convenient metrical form of diminutives tended to lead him, probably quite unconsciously, to extend the use of them. Rather, it illustrates the skill of his artistry, for it shows how he takes advantage of the metrical convenience of such words, and at the same time so weaves them into his pattern as to produce excellent stylistic effects, their colloquial flavour suiting quite well the informal tone of his hendecasyllabics. Both these factors may operate at the same time, without one entirely excluding the other, though which is predominant in a given case is quite difficult to determine with any degree of precision.

- - - -

Nor are style and meter the only factors in determining the use of diminutives. It would seem that the poet's fondness for the liquid sound of 'l' is also of no small importance in the matter.

In this connection, *salillo*, 23. 19, is of especial interest. Even de Labriolle and Ferrari with all their zeal in showing nuances of style in Catullus' diminutives, fail to find any in this rare word. Nor does the diminutive have any metrical advantage, for in this particular case, alone of all the above listed, the simplex, *salino*, has the same quantities. Thus, in meaning, style and metric, the two forms are virtually the same. The only obvious difference is that of sound. The diminutive doubles the l-sound in the word, re-echoing the 'l' of *culus*, with which it is closely related also in thought, by way of the comparison. And

¹Platner, Gow, *loc. citt.*, pp. 202, 155; Kroll, *passim*; Grebe, *Studia Catull.* (Amsterdam, 1912); *et al.*

²Notably, de Labriolle, Ferrari, *loc. citt.*

³De Labriolle, *loc. cit.*, p. 279.

the l-sound is again repeated in lapillis, two lines below, used in another comparison which balances the former one. In this, and certain other cases,¹ the element of sound alone seems to be the determining factor.

Catullus apparently delighted in the liquid l-sound at the last stress of the line, for besides the above listed 53 cases of such diminutives in this position, there are also the following:

13 instances of other words with double 'l': illuc, 3. 9; ille, 6. 9; collum, 9. 8; illic, 10. 14, 21; illuc, 15. 7; collo, 35. 9; ille, 47. 4; Tulli, 49. 2; illoc, 50. 5; tollens, 53. 4; vellem, 54. 4; illa, 58. 1;

8 with single 'l': malum, 2. 12; paulum, 10. 25; sodalis, 10. 29; 12. 13; filli, 33. 2; sodali, 35. 1; aequinocialis, 46. 2; sodales, 47. 6;

5 with 'l' followed by other consonants: sepulcrum, 7. 6; culpam, 15. 15; Golgos, 36. 14; vulgi, 40. 5; adulter, 57. 8;

And also: saeclo, 1. 10.

Thus, there are 80 verses out of 527 that have an l-sound at the last stress of the line.

In many cases, the l-sound at the end of the verse corresponds with one or more l-sounds earlier in the line, usually in the dactylic sequence, and frequently the words containing the l-sounds are closely related in thought or syntax, as for example, adjective and noun, lepidum . . . libellum, 1. 1; similarly, 2. 12; 3. 18; 14. 12; 45. 16; 46. 2; 55. 17; compare also, Veraniolum . . . Fabullum, 12. 17; genitive and noun, deliciae . . . puellae, 2. 1; cf. 32. 5, etc. etc.

In a goodly number of cases also, the l-sound at the end of one line is re-echoed at the end of another. For example, libelli, 1. 8, picks up libellum, v. 1. The two instances of the word set out the theme and help to unify the poem, placed at the beginning and towards the end, the dedication to Cornelius and the praise of his learned historical works forming the central part, in which, by implication, Cornelius' literary efforts are set high above the poet's own modest libellus. Various other stylistic effects seem to be enhanced by the same or similar repetitions of words involving l-sounds at the end of the verse. The repetition, meae puellae, 3. 3, 4, as Kroll remarks,² heightens the pathos. Compare in the same poem, puellae, ocelli, vv. 17, 18, and the resposion of the l's in flendo and turgiduli. Somewhat similar is the repetition, Fabullus, Fabullum, 12. 15, 17, and the diminutization of Veranius.³ Again, the 'll' in libellum, Catullum,

¹Cf. p. 67, infra.

²Ad loc.

³Cf. Kroll, ad loc.

14. 12, 13, seems to emphasize the playful petulance of the passage. Compare also: *lucelli*, *lucello*, 28. 6, 8; *puella*, *collo*, 35. 8, 9; *misellae*, *medullam*, *puella*, 35. 14, 15, 16; *codicillos*, 42. 11, 12, 19, 20, 24; *ocellos*, *Septimille*, *medullis*, 45. 11, 13, 16; *Fabullo*, *ille*, 47. 3, 4; *Tulli*, *Catullus*, 49. 2, 4; *puellae*, *papillis*, 55. 10, 12.¹

Feminine Abstract Nouns in -tio, -tionis

The following lines end with feminine abstracts in -tio:

Forming the quadrisyllabic ending, - 0 - -: *nationes*, 9. 7;

Forming five-syllable endings, 0 - 0 - -: *fututiones*, 32. 8; *vocationes*, 47. 7;

Forming six-syllable endings, - 0 - 0 - 0: *basiationes*, 7. 1; *aestimatione*, 12. 12; *esuritionum*, 21. 1; *irrumatione*, 21. 8; *esuritione*, 23. 14; *cogitationes*, 35. 5; *adlocutione*, 38. 5; *adlocutionis*, 38. 7; *adprobationem*, 45. 9; *osculationis*, 48. 6; *ambulatione*, 55. 6;

Forming the ending, 0 - 0 - 0 - 0: *inambulatione*, 6. 11.

Thus, there are 15 instances of such nouns at the end of hendecasyllabic verses; 16, with *adprobationem*, 45. 18.² All give long endings of four or more syllables.³

In other positions in this kind of verse, there are but 3 instances: *argutatio*, 6. 11, found here only, which makes a curious quintuplet assonance with *inambulatione*; and the common word, *ratio*. 10. 29; 42. 22, which is scarcely in the same category,⁴ twice forming the pyrrhic sequence.

¹See further, *infra*, p. 55.

²A rejected line; see p. 5, *supra*.

³Martial seems to have disliked such prosaic words, for this is the only category of words herein discussed which he does not use to any great extent at the end of hendecasyllabics, despite their metrical advantage, and the sanction of his master, Catullus. He has only 7 instances: *esuritionem*, 1. 99. 10; *fututionis*, 1. 106. 6; *oscitationes*, 11. 6. 4; *basiationes*, 11. 23. 4; *esuritionem*, v. 78. 18; *basiationes*, vii. 95. 17; *cogitationes*, xi. 6. 8. Except for *oscitatio*, he seems to have borrowed these words from Catullus. He has also at the end of the verse the proper names, *Philistionis*, 11. 41. 15; *Melanthione*, x. 67. 7, and the following similar words, *talassionem*, 1. 35. 6 (and xii. 95. 5; *-is*, 1. 35. 7); *uniones*, viii. 81. 4 (and xii. 49. 13); *mulionis*, ix. 57. 9; *morionem*, xii. 93. 3.

⁴An inherited word; Stolz-Schmalz, *Lat. Grammat.* (5th ed. revised by Leumann-Hofmann; München, 1928), p. 240.

In other kinds of verse, there are only 3 instances.¹

Of those at the end of hendecasyllabics, almost all are rare, and usually found only in prose. Adlocutio in the sense of 'consolation' occurs here for the first time, and there are but 6 other instances, all in late prose.² Adprobatio in the absolute sense occurs but four times elsewhere, and in prose only.³ Aestimatio with the meaning of pretium occurs here for the first time, and in this sense is rare among other classical writers.⁴ Ambulatio occurs elsewhere only in prose, and rarely, as here, of a covered portico.⁵ Basiatio and fututio are found elsewhere only in Martial.⁶ Cogitatio occurs here for the first time in poetry, and but a few times, and in late poetry, thereafter.⁷ Esuritio is rare and apparently here for the first time.⁸ Inambulatio is rare in general, and apparently unparalleled in the sense required here.⁹ Irrumatio is quoted here only.¹⁰ Osculatio is also rare.¹¹ Vocatio is quoted in the sense of 'invitation' here only.¹²

Although the suffix, -tio, was very productive in Latin,¹³ yet there was a marked tendency in the literary language of the classical period to avoid the frequent use of nouns of this sort,¹⁴ especially in poetry,¹⁵ and except at the end of hendecasyllabics, Catullus himself follows the general practice, using synonymous expressions elsewhere. Thus he has basiatio and osculatio here only, but basium 5 times, savium twice, osculum once;¹⁶ esuritio here only, but fames twice; aestimatio here only, but pretium twice elsewhere; adlocutio here only, but solaciolum, diminutive of the regular solacium, elsewhere. Similarly, tangam irrumatione,

¹Orationem, 44. 11, a common word; iocatio, 61. 127, which with Fescennina forms a periphrasis for the usual Fescennini, which cannot be got into the verse except by elision; and again the common word, ratio, 64. 186. Catullus has no nouns in -tio. In -io he has the proper name, Sirmio, 31. 1, 12; the rare sopionibus (?), 37. 10; religio, 90. 4.

²Thesaurus, I, 1691, 66.

³Ibid., II, 309, 74.

⁴Ibid., I, 1093, 49.

⁵Ibid., I, 1869, 77.

⁶Ibid., II, 1760, 37; VI, 1, 1664, 41 (cf. n. 3, p. 43).

⁷Ibid., III, 1446, 34.

⁸Cf. Merrill on 21. 1.

⁹Cf. Harpers' Latin Dict., s. v.

¹⁰Ibid., s. v.

¹¹Ibid., s. v.

¹²Cf. Merrill, Ellis, ad loc.

¹³Stolz-Schmalz, op. cit., p. 240.

¹⁴Cooper, Sermo Plebeius (New York, 1895), p. 3.

¹⁵Stolz, op. cit., I, 546.

¹⁶Ellis' subtle distinction (on 7. 1) seems pointless.

21. 8, is little more than a periphrasis for irrumabo, a verb which he has 6 times elsewhere. Again, he has the noun, fututio, here only, but the verb in various forms 6 times.

Thus, practically all the instances of nouns in -tio in Catullus occur at the end of hendecasyllabics, and since many of the particular words are rare, and Catullus himself elsewhere follows the usual classical practice of expressing himself without the aid of such words, it seems that their peculiar convenience in forming the verse-structure preferred at the end of the verse is of some importance in determining the use of them. Other factors of course contribute. The sound of the bright vowel, o-long, followed by the sonorous nasal 'n' probably pleased the poet's ear.¹ Further, these abstracts had, like diminutives, a colloquial ring about them,² and were thus admirably consonant with the informal language of hendecasyllabics.

Adjectives (and Adverbs) in -osus, -a, -um

The following lines end with adjectives (or adverbs) in -osus:

Forming trisyllabic endings, O - 0: pilosis, 16. 10; pilosas, 33. 7; iocosam, 56. 1; iocosa, 56. 4;

Forming quadrisyllabic endings, - O - 0: aestuosi, 7. 5; curiosi, 7. 11; otiosum, 10. 2; aestuosae, 46. 5; sumptuose, 47. 5; otiosi, 50. 1;

Forming five-syllable endings, O - O - 0: laboriosis, 1. 7; tenebricosum, 3. 11; febriculosi, 6. 4; harundinosam, 36. 13; laboriose, 38. 2; imaginosum, 41. 8.

Thus there are 16 instances of such words forming the preferred long endings of three or more syllables in hendecasyllabics.³ Ebriosioris, 27. 4, also stands at the end of the line.⁴

There are but 4 other instances in this kind of verse, all at the beginning of the line: ebrioso, 27. 4; iocose, 36. 10;

¹Cf. pp. 55 f. infra.

²Collin, "Nomina actionis," ALL, XIII (1904), 459; Olcott, Word Formation of Lat. Inscr. (Rome, 1898), p. 3; Cooper, loc. cit.; Slaughter, Substantives of Terence (Boston, 1891), p. 24; Rönisch, Itala u. Vulgata (2nd ed.; Marburg, 1875), pp. 69 f.; Lorenz, Mostellaria (2nd ed.; Berlin, 1883), on vv. 6, 34; Merrill on Cat. 7. 1.

³Martial also has 18 instances of such words at the end of hendecasyllabics, forming longer endings: 3 of three syllables, 3 of four, 11 of five, 1 of six.

⁴See p. 49, infra.

verbosa, 55. 20; morbosī, 57. 6.

Elsewhere in Catullus there are some 18 instances in various positions in different kinds of verse.¹ It is curious to note that Ovid and Martial frequently use adjectives in -osus of the form, - O O - O, after the diaeresis in pentameter,² but Catullus has not a single instance of this sort.³

For such adjectives, then, the end of hendecasyllabics is the favourite place in Catullus. Almost half of the total number of instances occur in this one position in this one kind of verse, whereas in other kinds of verse, there are proportionately fewer, and there is no especial position preferred for them.

Again, several of the adjectives in -osus used at the end of hendecasyllabics are rare words. Curiosus in the sense of 'inquisitive,' is, as Ellis remarks,⁴ not very common in the golden age, though it is common in the primary sense from Plautus on.⁵ Febriculosus occurs elsewhere only once each in Plautus,⁶ Gellius, and Fronto.⁷ Harundinosus and imarginosus are quoted here only.⁸ Laboriosus as used in l. 7, has the rather unusual passive meaning.⁹ Otiosus in the absolute sense seems to be comparatively uncommon.¹⁰ Tenebricosus is used several times by Cicero, but rare elsewhere.¹¹

¹Iocosa, 8. 6; araneoso, 25. 3; cuniculosae, 37. 18; sumptuosas, 44. 9; torosa, 63. 83; ventosum, 64. 12; ventosae, 64. 59; spinosas, 64. 72; frondosum, 64. 96; spumosa, 64. 121; nervosius, 67. 27; muscoso, 68. 58; formosa, 86. 1, 3, 5; verbosis, 98. 2; studioso, 116. 1; ostriosior, fr. l. 6.

²A. Zingerle, Spät. lat. Dichtern (Innsbruck, 1879), II, 36. W. Zingerle, Unters. zu den Heroiden (Innsbruck, 1878), p. 70, is also quoted in this connection, but I have been unable to consult this work.

³The only examples that occur in pentameter in Catullus are of the form, - - -, standing just before the diaeresis, 68. 58; 98. 2.

⁴Ad loc.

⁵Thesaurus IV, 1492, 6.

⁶If the reconstruction of Cist. 406 is right.

⁷Thesaurus VI, 1, 407, 66.

⁸Harpers' Latin Dict., s. vv.

⁹C. Calvus in poematis 'laboriosus' dicit, non ut vulgo dicitur 'qui laborat,' sed 'in quo laboratur,' Gellius N. A. ix. 12.

¹⁰Harpers' Latin Dict., s. v.

¹¹Ellis, ad loc.

Not only are some of the individual words here under discussion of rather rare occurrence, but this whole class of words was generally used rather sparingly by the best writers, except for a comparatively small number which established themselves in general use.¹ Cicero, for example, has barely one in fifty pages.² The relatively frequent use of them at the end of hendecasyllabics seems partly, at least, due to the fact that they supply polysyllabic types metrically suitable for the end of the verse.³ Again, of course, other factors are also at work. The syllable -os- in such words was pronounced with a peculiar sonority,⁴ which Catullus doubtless felt as having a poetic effect.⁵ And again the rather colloquial ring⁶ of such words was quite suitable for his nugae.

Masculine Abstract Nouns in -or, -oris

The following lines end with masculine abstracts in -or:

Forming trisyllabic endings, O - O: doloris, 2. 7; amores, 6. 16; 7. 8; 10. 1; leporum, 12. 8; amores, 13. 9; labores, 14. 11; amores, 15. 1; leporem, 16. 7; amores, 21. 4; lepores, 32. 2; amore, 35. 12; amores, 38. 6; 40. 7; ruborem, 42. 16; amores, 45. 1; tepores, 46. 1; lepore, 50. 7; dolorem, 50. 17.

Thus there are 19 instances of such nouns forming the preferred trisyllabic endings in hendecasyllabics.⁷ So also, amoris, 55. 22.⁸ Compare labos est, 55. 13.⁹

¹Baehrens, Appendix Probi (Halle, 1922), p. 119; Cooper, op. cit., p. 122; Ulrich De Vitr. copia verb. (Schwabach, 1885), II, 4.

²Cooper, op. cit., p. 123.

³Cf. Schönwerth-Weyman, "Adjektiva auf -osus," ALL, V (1888), 201.

⁴Idem (sc. veteres) voces quae pressiore sono eduntur, ausus, causa, fusus, odiosus, per duo s scribebant, Mar. Vict. K. VI, 8.

⁵Cf. pp. 55 f. infra.

⁶Cooper, loc. cit. and bibliography there cited. For the more philological aspects, see Schönwerth-Weyman, loc. cit.; Stolz, op. cit., I, 536; Stolz-Schmalz, op. cit., p. 231; Paucker, Vorarbeiten (Berlin, 1884), I, 72; II, 34.

⁷Martial has 28 instances of such nouns, all giving trisyllabic endings: he has also 9 instances of the noun, soror, in oblique cases, filling this position.

⁸A rejected line; see p. 5, supra.

⁹Also rejected. Cf. p. 13, n. 2, supra.

In other positions in this kind of verse, there are only about half as many instances: ardor, 2. 8; rumores, 5. 2; furor, 15. 14; sudor, 23. 16; furor, 46. 2; furore, 50. 11; labore, 50. 14; amoris, 55. 19; languoribus, 58b. 9, not to mention Amor, 45. 8, 17. This distribution is the more striking when one considers the various verse-types such nouns may supply: *āmōr*, *āmōrīs*, *āmōribūs*; *sūdōr*, *sūdōrīs*, *sūdōribūs*, which are metrically suitable in various positions in hendecasyllabics.

In other kinds of verse there are some 82 instances,¹ which are for the most part scattered in various positions in different kinds of verse.²

Abstracts in *-or* are fairly common from the earliest writers down through the classical period.³ In general they are "characteristic of an elevated style,"⁴ and Catullus uses them

¹*Amorem*, 11. 21; *stupor*, 17. 21; *error*, 22. 20; *amorem*, 30. 8; *labore*, 31. 9; *laboribus*, 31. 11; *humore*, 61. 25; *amore*, 61. 33; *amoris*, 61. 45; *puđor*, 61. 83; *amorem*, 61. 130, 205; *ardor*, 62. 29; *erroribus*, 63. 18; *labore*, 63. 36; *languore*, 63. 37; *sopor*, 63. 37; *furor*, 63. 38, 78; *furoris*, 63. 79; *furor*, 63. 92; *amore*, 64. 19; *amores*, 64. 27; *furores*, 64. 54; *odores*, 64. 87; *colores*, 64. 90; *furores*, 64. 94; *timores*, 64. 99; *fulgore*, 64. 100; *error*, 64. 115; *amorem*, 64. 120; *labore*, 64. 161; *amore*, 64. 182; *furore*, 64. 197; *amore*, 64. 253; *plangore*, 64. 273; *odore*, 64. 284; *laborem*, 64. 310; *amorem*, 64. 330; *amores*, 64. 334; *amor*, 64. 335; *terroris*, 64. 338; *amores*, 64. 372; *furore*, 64. 405; *dolore*, 65. 1; *maeroribus*, 65. 15; *rubor*, 65. 24; *nitor*, 66. 3; *amor*, 66. 6; *timore*, 66. 72; *amor*, 66. 88; *amore*, 67. 25, 35; *amor*, 68. 24; *sudore*, 68. 61; *amores*, 68. 69; *amore*, 68. 73; *cruorem*, 68. 79; *amorem*, 68. 83; *amor*, 68. 96; *amoris*, 68. 107; *amor*, 68. 117; *furores*, 68. 129; *odore*, 68. 144; *amorem*, 71. 3; *odore*, 71. 6; *amore*, 76. 6; *amorem*, 76. 13; *torpor*, 76. 21; *amores*, 78. 3; *amore*, 87. 4; 91. 2; *amor*, 91. 6; *dolore*, 96. 2; *amores*, 96. 3; *dolori*, 96. 5; *amore*, 96. 6; *amori*, 99. 11, 15; *amore*, 100. 8; *amorem*, 109. 1; *laborem*, 116. 5.

²In hexameters, however, there is an even greater proportion at the end of the verse, there being 36 instances supplying trisyllabic endings; these are indicated by underlining in n. 1, *supra*.

³Cooper, *op. cit.*, p. 25; Meyer-Lübke, "Geschichte der lat. Abstracta," *ALL*, VIII (1893), 313; Gölzer, *Latinité de St. Jérôme* (Paris, 1884), p. 90; Paucker, *De latinitate Hieron.* (Berlin, 1880), p. 28; Rassow, "De Plauti Substant.," *Neue Jahrb. class. Phil.* Sup. XII (1881), 609.

⁴Cooper, *ibid.*; cf. Slaughter, *op. cit.*, p. 21; Floen, *De cop. verb. differentiis* (Strassburg, 1883), p. 42.

most freely in his more formal work, there being 23 instances in c. 64 alone. He has, however, some 30 instances in hendecasyllabics, 20 of which supply the useful trisyllabic verse-ending. Besides their metrical convenience, these words give a sonorous close to the verse, with their penult in the bright vowel, o-long, followed by the resonant 'r'.¹

Comparatives in -ior, -ioris

The following lines end with comparatives in -ior, -ioris:

Forming quadrisyllabic endings, - o - o: *mundiorem*, 23.

18; *acriorque*, 45. 15;

Forming five-syllable endings, o - o - o: *venustiorum*, 3. 2; *severiorum*, 5. 2; *beatiorum*, 9. 10; *beatiusve*, 9. 11; *beatiorum*, 10. 17; *cinaediorum*, 10. 24; *amariores*, 27. 2; *voraciore*, 33. 4; *beatiores*, 45. 25;

Forming six-syllable endings, - o - o - o: *neglegentiorum*, 12. 3; *elegantiusvest*, 13. 10; *ebriosioris*, 27. 4; *inquinatiore*, 33. 3; *auspicatiorem*, 45. 26.

Thus there are 16 hendecasyllabics ending with such comparatives, all but 2 of which are of five or six syllables in length.² Compare also, *minore*, 55. 3.³

In other positions in this kind of verse, there is a fair number of comparatives, but none of six syllables and but one of five, *interiorem*, 35. 15, which is elided, thus forming a four-syllable verse-type. Passing over 4 instances of plus, we find: 6 dissyllabic comparatives:- *magis*, 38. 3; *maior*, 45. 15; *magis*, 57. 8, in different positions, and *prior*, 21. 8; *magis*, 23. 13; 38. 3, forming the pyrrhic; 10 trisyllabic:- *unctius*, 10. 11; *purior*, 23. 19; *minore*, 28. 12; *maestius*, 38. 8; *amplius*, 42. 23, in various positions, and *laetius*, 9. 11; *suavius*, 13. 10; *durius*, 23. 21; *doctior*, 35. 17; *densior*, 48. 5, of the form - o o, giving the pyrrhic; 3 quadrisyllabic:- *sicciora*, 23. 12; *altiore*, 42. 18; *perditius*, 42. 14, the last supplying the pyrrhic, as also *interiorem*, 35. 15. Plus omitted, then, there are 20 instances of comparatives in hendecasyllabics in positions other than at the end of the verse, and these are shorter words. Some 10 of them, however, form the pyrrhic sequence, thus also supplying useful types.

In other kinds of verse, though there are some 91 compar-

¹Cf. pp. 55 f. infra.

²Martial has 33 instances: 5 of three syllables (forms of minor and prior), 7 of four, 16 of five, 5 of six.

³A rejected line; see p. 5, supra.

atives,¹ there are none of six syllables, and only 10 of five. Of these 10, only 2 form trochaic sequences,² and 8 give dactylic.³ It is clear from these occasional instances that long comparatives would be metrically useful in other kinds of verse, but the number of occurrences is proportionately much greater at the end of hendecasyllabics, where long words are especially desirable. Even four-syllable comparatives are relatively infrequent in other kinds of verse, there being but 18 instances, 15 forming dactyls,⁴ and only 3 trochaic sequences.⁵ Similarly the trisyllabic, for the most part form dactyls in hexameters and elegiacs.⁶

The above accounts for the distribution of all comparatives in Catullus, except a few dissyllabic or monosyllabic instances of magis, minor, plus and prior, which are of no significance for the present. It is clear that the long trochaic comparatives at the end of hendecasyllabics are a unique feature of the verse. The fact that there are proportionately but a few instances of such long ones elsewhere in Catullus, and that comparatives in general form dactyls rather than trochees makes it clear that these forms have a peculiar advantage for the end of hendecasyllabic verses.

It is further to be observed that several of the comparatives at the end of hendecasyllabics are what may be termed 'weakened' comparatives,⁷ for which the positives might serve

¹Including amplius, magis, minus, plus, potius, prior.

²Infacetiior, 22. 14; expolitiior, 39. 20.

³Delicatiior, 17. 15; diligentius, 17. 16; amabiliior, 65. 10; deterioriior, 68. 114; candidiior, 68. 148; 80. 2; 107. 6; ostriosiior, fr. 1. 6.

⁴Libentiior, 61. 41; crudeliior, 62. 20; crudelius, 62. 24; iucundiior, 62. 26; optatiior, 62. 30; iucundiior, 64. 215; languidiior, 67. 21; nervosius, 67. 27; meliior, 68. 28; improbiior, 68. 126; impensius, 72. 5; acerbius, 73. 5; pallidiior, 81. 4; immundiior, 97. 3; feliciior, 107. 7.

⁵Rapaciior, 25. 4; beatiior, 31. 7; ineptiior, 39. 16.

⁶Potius, 64. 82, 150; fortiior, 66. 28; potius, 66. 92; amplius, 68. 14; lenius, 68. 64; dulciior, 68. 106; pluribus, 68. 115; altiior, 68. 117; carior, 68. 159; villiior, 72. 6; leviior, 72. 6; graviior, 73. 5; ampliior, 76. 10; carior, 82. 2, 3, 4; acrior, 83. 5; mundiior, 97. 3; mundiior, 97. 4; meliior, 97. 4; dulciior, 99. 2; ampliior, 99. 3; tristiior, 99. 14; potius, 100. 5; carior, 104. 2; carior, 107. 3; potius, 111. 3. There are but 6 giving trochaic sequences: tritiior, 22. 13; molliior, 25. 1; ampliior, 39. 21; veriior, 44. 5; pulchriior, 61. 88; prioriior, 76. 1.

⁷Cf. Kroll, Merrill, on 3. 2.

equally well so far as meaning is concerned. Thus, *beatiorum*, 9. 10, differs in meaning but slightly from the simple positive. The passage is now understood as meaning: 'Of all happy men, who is happier than I?' with *o* as exclamatory, not vocative.¹ Since *laetius beatiusve*, v. 11, imply a comparison with *beatiorum*, v. 10, the latter is virtually equivalent of the positive. It is curious to compare this line, *o quantum est hominum beatiorum*, 9. 10, with *et quantum est hominum venustiorum*, 3. 2. The two are identical in verse-structure word for word, and the long sonorous ending is in both a weakened comparative. Again, *unum beatiorem*, 10. 17, means much the same as *unum e beatis*, like *une de capillatis*, 37. 17, in which there is no comparative idea. In *cinaediorum*, 10. 24, there is no specific comparison involved; indeed, even the full force of the positive can scarcely be pressed. *Neglegentiorum*, 12. 3, is used in the same way. With *severiorum*, 5. 2, it is interesting to compare *severos*, 27. 6, for the essential meaning is the same in both cases. Exact analysis of *mundiorum*, 23. 18, is a bit difficult. *Mundiorum* may modify *munditiam* directly, and if so, it is a weakened comparative, thus: 'To this rather elegant elegance add the fact that,' or *mundiorum* may have a second *munditiam* understood with it, thus: 'To this elegance, add the more elegant elegance, that'. This latter is probably right, for the order of words strongly suggests it, and in that case, the comparative has full force. It is even more difficult to analyze the *jeu de mots* of the comparatives in 33. 3, 4. Certainly there is a comparison in thought, but it would remain even if the positives were used.

Such weakened comparatives are of course regular Latin. But it is noteworthy that there are some half-dozen examples among this one group of polysyllabic comparatives ending hendecasyllabic verses. In other positions in hendecasyllabics, Catullus has no examples.² In other kinds of verse, he has but three examples, two of which are virtually the same: *melior*, 68. 28; *candidior*, 68. 148; 107. 6; these give dactyls in the second half of pentameters.³

These facts further point to the metrical factor as being

¹Cf. Kroll, *ad loc.*

²Merrill takes *unctius*, 10. 11, as such. But it seems more reasonable to regard it as a true comparative, in the sense of 'wealthier than before he went.' Cf. *maior acriorque*, 45. 15, meaning 'greater and keener than in yours,' although there is no specific comparison expressed.

³Cf. Kroll on 68. 148.

important in determining the use of comparatives at the end of hendecasyllabics.¹

Genitive Plurals in -orum and -arum

The following lines end with genitive plurals of the first and second declensions in -orum and -arum:

Forming quadrisyllabic endings, - 0 - 0: Italorum, 1. 5; basiorum, 5. 13; impiorum, 14. 7; basiorum, 16. 12;

Forming five-syllable endings, 0 - 0 - 0: ineptiarum, 6. 14; facetiarum, 12. 9; araneorum, 13. 8; librariorum, 14. 17; ineptiarum, 14b. 1; periculatorum, 23. 11; Inventiorum, 24. 1; puellularum, 57. 9;

Forming six-syllable endings, - 0 - 0 - 0: balneariorum, 33. 1; inficetiarum, 36. 19.

Thus there are 14 instances of such polysyllabic genitive plurals at the end of hendecasyllabics.² Note also quorum, 23. 3.

In other positions in this kind of verse, there are but 4 such genitives: mear(um), 14b. 1, which goes with ineptiarum at the end of the verse; harum, 21. 2, and horum, 24. 2, both used in the same expression; ventorum, 58b. 6. It is curious that 3 of these are short pronominals, and the only noun is of three syllables, whereas all those at the end of the verse (except quorum, 23. 3) are of four or more.

In all the rest of Catullus' work, there are but 34 instances. None of these is of six syllables in length, and only one is of five, and it stands at the end of an hypermetrical line, giving a four-syllable verse-type.³ There are but 7 of four syllables, and among these, there is no noteworthy regularity of position in any particular kind of verse.⁴ The majority are trisyllabic, and most of these form spondaic, not trochaic, sequences.⁵

¹Cf. Stolz-Schmalz, op. cit., p. 465; Kroll on 3. 2.

²Martial has 34 instances: 16 of three syllables, 7 of four, 9 of five, 2 of six.

³Reconditor(um), 34. 11.

⁴Insularum, 31. 1 bis; cachinnorum, 31. 14; puellarum, 37. 4; innuptarum, 64. 78; satyror(um), 64. 252; Argivorum, 68. 87.

⁵Silvarum, 34. 10; ferarum, 63. 53; ear(um), 63. 54; deor(um), 63. 75; saeculorum, 64. 22; curarum, 64. 62; ventorum, 64. 239; gnator(um), 64. 349; deorum, 64. 406; Musar(um), 65. 3; ramorum, 65. 13; stellar(um), 66. 2; dearum, 66. 9; Musar(um), 68. 10; stultorum, 68. 137; nasor(um), 69. 9; notorum, 79. 4; nymphar(um), 88. 6; Persar(um), 90. 4; illorum, 102. 3; bonorum, 108. 3; nuptarum, 111. 2.

There are but 4 dissyllabic, all pronominal, in spondaic sequences.¹

The polysyllabic genitives at the end of hendecasyllables are a unique feature of the verse. Elsewhere in Catullus, such polysyllabic forms occur but rarely, and even shorter words with this ending are relatively infrequent. Indeed, it would seem that there was a tendency elsewhere to avoid the ending itself, for not only is it relatively rare, but in 13 out of 38 cases it is elided, and with certain words the contract form in -um occurs rather than -orum.²

It is further to be observed that these genitives are of words which can be used at the end of hendecasyllabic verse only in the genitive plural, and that any other form of these words would break one or other of the laws of verse-structure.³ Those of the form, 0 - 0 - 0, in other cases have the form, 0 - 0 0, which either gives the anomalous trochee, divides the pyrrhic, or leaves a monosyllabic ending (unless elided).⁴ Those of the form, - 0 - 0 - 0, in other cases have the form, - 0 - 0 0, which must either give the anomalous trochee, or require a monosyllabic ending (unless elided).⁵

It seems evident, then, that metrical considerations are of no small importance in determining the use of polysyllabic genitives in -orum and -arum at the end of hendecasyllables. With this in mind, certain specific cases are interesting as regards syntax and other linguistic and stylistic matters.

Note, for example that *cum tantum sciat esse basiorum*, 5. 13, and *qui tantum tibi misit impiorum*, 14. 7, are identical in metrical structure word for word. Both have tantum with the genitive and both tantum and the genitive supply the same verse-types in the same positions in both cases. Tantum basiorum and tantum impiorum are equivalent of tot basia and tot impios, and whereas Catullus has tot 4 times elsewhere, nowhere else does he have tantum with the genitive. He does have 3 instances of quantum with the genitive: 3. 2; 9. 10; 88. 4.⁶

Somewhat similar is *quid ineptiarum*, 6. 14, which is

¹Harum, 64. 256; quorum, 64. 278; horum, 68. 129; quor(um), 78. 1.

²Deorum, 63. 75; 64. 406, but deum, 63. 68; 64. 23; 66. 63; divum, 64. 27, 134, 298, 387; 66. 69; 76. 4; virum, 64. 192; 68. 90; never divorum, virorum.

³This latter does not apply to the first four listed.

⁴See Table IV, positions 5, 8, 10.

⁵See Table V, positions, 2, 9.

⁶On the first two of these, cf. p. 51, supra.

equivalent of quas ineptias. Elsewhere Catullus has quid with the genitive only in 6. 4 and 38. 7, in both of which also the genitive construction involves a polysyllable at the end of hendecasyllabic verse.

Again, unus Italorum, 1. 5, is unparalleled in Catullus. Elsewhere he has una de capillatis, 37. 17; una ex multis, 68. 36.

These usages are, of course, regular Latin, but the occurrence of them in Catullus is closely related to the metrical structure of the kind of verse in which they occur.

In 12. 9, however, the genitive with disertus is quite unusual. It is needless for the present to consider the various emendations proposed, or to classify the genitive according to grammatical categories, but it is interesting to compare pleni rursus et inficetiarum, 36. 19, in which the regular genitive construction with plenus accommodates the long genitive at the end of the verse. It seems that the genitive in 12. 9, is used by analogy with it, and for the same reason, namely, to secure the long ending.

Puellularum, 57. 9, also is difficult to classify grammatically. It may be similar to such expressions of sharing as particeps with the genitive.¹ But whatever the grammatical category, the syntax seems to have been considerably influenced by the metrical necessity of using the genitive plural of the word.

In three cases, the genitive is part of a periphrasis. Thus, ineptiarum lectores eritis, 14b. 1, is but another way of saying ineptias legetis, or legere voletis, parallel with horrebitis admove. But ineptias must involve either a broken pyrrhic or a monosyllabic ending.² Librarium scrinia, 14. 17, is but a periphrasis for librarias, which has the same metrical difficulty, but the periphrasis is doubly helpful, for it not only accommodates the long ending, but also gives the pyrrhic for the next line. So also, casus alios periculorum, 23. 11, is little more than alia pericula. These two words cannot be got into the same line. Pericula itself would stand only with the admission of the anomalous trochee (or by elision). The periphrasis lets the word stand at the end of the line, forming a polysyllabic ending.

Another rather curious point is involved in the genitive in 16. 12, milia basiorum. This reference puzzles the commentators. Some take these words to refer to cc. 5, 7, because of the similarity of the phrasing. But the whole poem clearly refers to Juventius' relation to Catullus as expressed in c. 48. The

¹Cf. particeps amoris, 55. 22.

²Martial also uses a periphrasis with this word in hendecasyllables: nostrarum tineas ineptiarum, xi. 1. 14.

similarity of the phrasing with cc. 5, 7, seems to be due simply to the fact that Catullus availed himself of the same useful words and phrases largely for the sake of the verse. Note how the same words recur in the same positions in the line in these four poems: *basia*, 5. 7; 7. 9, and *milia*, 5. 10; 16. 12; 48. 3, forming the pyrrhic; *basiorum*, 5. 13; 16. 12, and *basiare*, 7. 9; 48. 2, giving long verse-endings; *multa*, 5. 10; 7. 9; 16. 12, following the pyrrhic. Thus, there are similarities between all four poems, and the words; *milia multa basiorum*, 16. 12, seem to result simply from the need of expressing the same idea, and at the same time preserving the verse-structure.

- - - -

In the groups of words just discussed, one is again¹ struck by the recurrence of certain sounds at the last stress of the verse. Of the lines listed, almost all have one or other of the sonorous consonants, n, s, or r, in this position, usually preceded by the bright vowel, o-long. These lines also for the most part have a correspondence of resonant liquids, nasals and sibilants, and a preponderance of o-vowels, as for example: *et solaciolum sui doloris*, 2. 7; *oraculum Iovis inter aestuosi*, 7. 5; *narrantem loca, facta, nationes*, 9. 7; *non dico pueris, sed his pilosis*, 16. 10; *qua solatus es adlocutione*, 38. 5; *sit nostrae seges osculationis*, 48. 6; *ex quo perspiceres meum dolorem*, 50. 17.

Such various 'sound-patterns' within the lines are too numerous and too diverse to be analyzed and classified here. But it is of especial interest in the present connection, that, whether or not they have responsions within each individual line in which they occur, the sonorous consonants, l, n, s, and r, are very frequent at the last stress of the line, which seems to indicate that sound² is another important factor in determining the use of the words above discussed. In 527 lines, these consonants occur at the last stress of the verse 384 times:

80 instances with 'l', listed p. 42, supra;

14 instances of 'n' in nouns in -tio, listed p. 43, supra;

¹Cf. pp. 41 f. supra.

²The extent to which Latin poets sought to please the ear by the use of rhyme, assonance, and various other 'sound-effects' is only just beginning to be recognized. Marouzeau, "Le style oral lat.," Rev. Études lat., X (1932), 186, claims this as one of the original features of Latin poetry, having a tradition that antedates Greek influence. For bibliography, see Pease, Aeneid IV (Cambridge, Mass., 1935), pp. 83, 131.

30 further instances of 'n': harenae, 7. 3; Cyrenis, 7. 4; vino, 12. 2; Pollioni, 12. 6; Vatiniano, 14. 3; Aquinos, 14. 18; venena, 14. 19; pene, 15. 9; una, 21. 5; ruinas, 23. 9; veneni, 23. 10; Favoni, 26. 2; Thyonianus, 27. 7; inanis, 28. 1; supinum, 28. 9; supinus, 32. 10; rapinae, 33. 6; poena, 40. 8; Formiani, 41. 4; Gallicani, 42. 9; lupanar, 42. 13; leoni, 45. 7; patronus, 49. 7; vinum, 50. 6; corona, 53. 1; Vatiniana, 53. 2; Libonis, 54. 3; Dionae, 56. 6; Formiana, 57. 4; unam, 58. 2;

7 instances of 'nn': eachinnis, 13. 5; annis, 21. 3; anno, 23. 20; annis, 24. 3; annos, 45. 4; annis, 49. 3; cachinno, 56. 2;

33 instances of 'n' followed by other consonants, mostly 'nt' or 'nd': adpetenti, 2. 3; nitenti, 2. 5; dormienda, 5. 6; centum, 5. 7, 8, 9; inelegantes, 6. 2; pandas, 6. 13; lingua, 7. 12; trecentis, 9. 2; neglegentem, 10. 34; talento, 12. 7; trecentos, 12. 10; clienti, 14. 6; pudentem, 15. 2; pudenter, 15. 13; instruentem, 21. 7; parente, 23. 5; parentis, 23. 6; ducentos, 26. 4; pestilentem, 26. 5; relinquens, 35. 3; nuntiantur, 35. 11; ponto, 36. 11; putandum, 42. 15; lingua, 43. 4; ante, 45. 8; amantur, 45. 20; mundi, 47. 2; Iuventi, 48. 1; trecenta, 48. 3; eluentur, 57. 5; quaeritando, 58b. 10;

9 instances of 'gn' or 'mn': maligne, 10. 18; magnam, 13. 3; ignis, 23. 2; omnes, 23. 7; lignis, 36. 8; ignem, 36. 18; omnes, 42. 2; 55. 19; 58. 3;

16 instances of 's' in adjectives and adverbs in -osus, listed p. 45, supra;

5 further instances of 's': visumst, 10. 3; nasum, 13. 14; nasi, 23. 17; naso, 41. 3; 43. 1;

20 instances of 'ss': possem, 2. 9; passer, 3. 16; assis, 5. 3; possunt, 5. 4; possit, 5. 12; posses, 6. 3; esset, 10. 6; incidisset, 10. 19; posset, 10. 23; necessest, 12. 16; lacessas, 15. 16; necessest, 16. 6; possunt, 16. 9; 23. 4; possis, 23. 23; dedisses, 24. 4; essem, 36. 4; esse, 42. 14; essem, 50. 13; explicasset, 53. 3;

44 instances of 's' followed by other consonants: Cupidinesque, 3. 1; abstulisti, 3. 15; beatiusve, 9. 11; invenustum, 10. 4; comparasti, 10. 15; sinistra, 12. 1; invenustast, 12. 5; noster, 13. 6; elegantiusvest, 13. 10; Cupidinesque, 13. 12; isto, 14. 2; attulisti, 14. 22; vestras, 14b. 2; cupisti, 15. 3; malisque, 15. 10; mugilesque, 15. 19; putastis, 16. 3; discet, 21. 11; fricesque, 23. 22; Austri, 26. 1; magistrae, 27. 3; isto, 28. 4; tulisti, 28. 5; irrumasti, 28. 10; fuistis, 28. 11; venuste, 35. 17; invenustumst, 36. 17; poposcit, 41. 2; estis, 42. 1; potestis, 42. 5; moleste, 42. 8; potestis, 42. 23; tosta, 45. 6; Britanniasque, 45. 22; libidinesque, 45. 24; vigescunt, 46. 8; sinistrae, 47. 1; aristis, 48. 5; nostrum, 50. 4; facetiis-

que, 50. 8; postquam, 50. 14; nostras, 50. 18; utrisque, 57. 3;
volatilesque, 58b. 5;

one instance of 'ps': ipsis, 10. 9;

19 instances of 'r' in nouns in -or, listed p. 47, supra;

13 instances in comparatives in -ior, listed p. 49, supra;

14 instances in genitive plurals, listed, p. 52, supra;

44 further instances of 'r': tenere, 2. 2; iocari, 2. 6;
curas, 2. 10; norat, 3. 6; fateri, 6. 5; tacere, 6. 12; basiare,
7. 9; Hiberum, 9. 6; haberet, 10. 7; aere, 10. 8; habere, 10. 28;
pararim, 10. 32; Hiberis, 12. 14; amarem, 14. 1; periret, 14. 14;
dierum, 14. 15; Furi, 16. 2; fuerunt, 21. 2; experiris, 21. 6;
tacerem, 21. 9; esurire, 21. 10; quorum, 23. 3; Furi, 23. 24;
precari, 23. 26; amari, 24. 6; severos, 27. 6; abire, 32. 6; oras,
33. 5; venditare, 33. 8; morari, 35. 10; daturam, 36. 7; horas,
38. 3; curae, 41. 5; rogare, 41. 7; reddituram, 42. 4; ore, 42.
17; perire, 45. 5; auris, 46. 3; vagari, 46. 7; basiare, 48. 2;
futurus, 48. 4; iuvaret, 50. 9; crura, 54. 2; dicares, 58b. 7;

2 instances of 'rr': referret, 10. 11; porro, 45. 3;

29 instances of 'r' followed by other consonants: chartis,
1. 6; virgo, 1. 9; morsus, 2. 4; ardor, 2. 8; versu, 6. 17; super-
que, 7. 2; cohorti, 10. 10; cohortem, 10. 13; repertum, 14. 8;
porta, 15. 18; arca, 23. 1; cornu, 23. 12; parvi, 23. 25; arca,
24. 5, 8; arcam, 24. 10; Falerni, 27. 1; verpa, 28. 12; charta,
36. 1; apertos, 36. 12; tabernam, 36. 15; turpis, 42. 3; acriorque,
45. 15; urbes, 46. 6; reportant, 46. 11; disertum, 53. 5; angli-
portis, 58. 4; Perseus, 58b. 3; cursum, 58b. 6;

4 instances of 'tr' or 'br': matrem, 3. 7; tenebrae, 3.
13; matrem, 9. 4; tenebrae, 55. 2.

CHAPTER V
RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN VERSE-STRUCTURE AND
DICTION: THE PYRRHIC SEQUENCE

As at the end of the verse, so also in the pyrrhic sequence, words of certain categories frequently recur: nouns and adjectives in -ius, -ia, -ium (exclusive of neuter plurals in -a), neuter plurals in -a, the pyrrhic pronominal forms, ego, mihi, tibi, sibi, diminutives and other words in -ulus (-olus), and -culus. Of the 480 lines in which the pyrrhic is undivided, about one in three has that sequence formed of words belonging to one or other of these four categories.

Nouns and Adjectives in -ius, -ia, -ium

The following lines have the pyrrhic formed of nouns or adjectives in -ius, -ia, -ium (exclusive of neuter plurals in -a):

The 'i' forming the first short of the pyrrhic:

Giving the verse-type, - 0 0: Lesbia, 7. 2; Gaius, 10.

30; filius, 33. 4; Lesbia, 43. 7; 58. 1, 2;

Giving the verse-type, - - 0 0: Bithynia, 10. 7; provincia, 10. 19; Veranius, 12. 16; provincia, 43. 6;

The 'i' forming the second short:

Giving the verse-type, 0 0: gremi(o), 3. 8; vari(i), 10. 6; soci(i), 57. 9;

Giving the verse-type, - 0 0: Caecil(i)o, 35. 18; Idali(um), 36. 12; Durrachi(um), 36. 15;

Giving the verse-type, 0 0 -: Syrio, 6. 8; odio, 14. 3; veniam, 15. 2; aliis, 21. 3; alios, 23. 11; aliis, 24. 3; aliud, 42. 16; gremio, 45. 2; Syrias, 45. 22; Phrygii, 46. 4; Asiae, 46. 6; studio, 46. 8; variae, 46. 11; trivio, 47. 7; aliis, 49. 3;

Giving the verse-type, - 0 0 -: deliciae, 2. 1; delicias, 6. 1; suppliciis, 14. 20; insidiis, 15. 16; insidias, 21. 7; divitias, 24. 4; Postumiae, 27. 3; deliciae, 32. 2; exsilium, 33. 5; Caecilio, 35. 2; Septimius, 45. 1; auspicio, 45. 19; Septimius, 45. 21; Septimio, 45. 23; delicias, 45. 24; Sufficio, 54. 5; quadrivitiis, 58. 4;

Giving the verse-type, - - 0 0 -: desiderio, 2. 5.

Thus there are some 49 instances. There is nothing of general interest stylistically in the above list, since nomina of this sort are of the commonest. They abound in Catullus throughout, but in no other kind of verse do they recur so frequently in

one particular position.¹

Neuter Plurals in -a

The following lines have the pyrrhic formed of neuter plurals in -a:

Giving the verse-type, 0 0: loca, 9. 7; tua, 12. 7; mala, 14. 6; 28. 14;

Giving the verse-type, - 0 0: omnia, 3. 14; basia, 5. 7; altera, 5. 8, 9; milia, 5. 10; sidera, 7. 7; basia, 7. 9; lintea, 12. 3; scrinia, 14. 18; omnia, 14. 19; milia, 16. 12; impia, 23. 10; corpora, 23. 12; commoda, 23. 24; milia, 26. 4; frigoraqu(e), 28. 5; moenia, 35. 4; milia, 41. 2; 48. 3; mutua, 50. 6; crimina, 53. 3; rustica, 54. 2; omnia, 54. 4;

Giving the verse-type, - - 0 0: sudaria, 12. 14; incommoda, 14. 23; incendia, 23. 9; sestertia, 23. 26; opprobria, 28. 15; convivia, 47. 5;

Giving the verse-type, 0 0 - 0 0: electissima, 36. 6; pugillaria, 42. 5; semimortua, 50. 15.

There are some 36 instances. Though Catullus has a considerable number of neuter plurals in -a elsewhere, in no other kind of verse are they collocated so frequently in one position in the line.²

It is interesting to note also that in a goodly number of lines, the words modifying, or modified by, the above listed words also form useful verse-types. Thus, in the following, not only does the neuter plural form the pyrrhic, but also involves the type, - 0, immediately following: omnia bella, 3. 14; milia multa, 5. 10; sidera multa, 7. 7; basia multa, 7. 9; tua furta, 12. 7; mala multa, 14. 6; 28. 14; milia multa, 16. 12; convivia lauta, 47. 5. Note also, basia, altera, altera, 5. 7, 8, 9, forming the pyrrhic in three successive lines.

Other than the correspondence between the form of the words and their position in the verse, however, there is nothing striking in this category as a whole. But some few individual cases are of especial interest.

¹Including 11 instances of the adverbial accusative, nimum, Martial also has 161 instances of this kind of nomina in this part of the verse: 46 ending in 0 0, in which the 'i' forms the first of the two shorts; 115 ending in 0 0 -, in which the 'i' forms the second short, there being no elided forms.

²Martial also has 103 instances of neuter plurals in -a, ending in 0 0, forming the pyrrhic in hendecasyllabics (exclusive of neuter plurals of words in -ulus [-olus], and -culus).

The word basium occurs first in the above listed passages, and not again till the writers of the Empire.¹ The word is well suited to the colloquial tone of hendecasyllabics.² Catullus has it but once elsewhere, namely, 99. 16, where it forms a dactyl following the diaeresis in pentameter. But in hendecasyllabics, he has it 4 times, twice giving a longer ending,³ and twice, as above listed, forming the pyrrhic. Elsewhere he uses other synonyms: osculum once, savium and saviolum twice each.

Milia occurs 5 times in the above list; see p. 55, supra.

It is curious also to note that altera, 5. 8, 9, is used twice, whereas the usual synonym, secunda, is used but once, in the same passage.

On the periphrasis, librarium scrinia, 14. 18, see p. 54, supra, and compare Novi relinquit Comi moenia, 35. 4. In neither case, does the neuter plural add anything essential to the meaning, but merely fills out the periphrasis.

In three cases, the neuter plural is used as an abstract with reference to persons: omnia venena, 14. 19; saecli incommoda, 14. 23; opprobria Romuli, 28. 15. Elsewhere Catullus uses the singular in such expressions, as for example, nostrae crudele venenum vitae, heu nostrae pestis amicitiae, 77. 5, 6; scabies famesque mundi, 47. 2.

Frigora, 28. 5, is used in the plural apparently purely for metrical reasons, since it usually occurs in the singular, and is in the present case balanced by a singular, famem.

Pugillaria, 42. 5, is rare in the neuter.⁴ The neuter form conveniently gives the pyrrhic, whereas the usual masculine, pugillares, is unmetrical. Elsewhere Catullus uses other synonyms: tabellis, 50. 2; codicilli, 42. 11, etc.

Pyrrhic Pronominals

The following lines have the pyrrhic formed of pronominals giving the verse-type, 0 0:

Ego: 14. 4; 16. 1; 56. 6; 58b. 3;

Mihi: 2. 11; 3. 15; 7. 1; 9. 2, 5; 10. 3, 8, 18, 25; 12. 6, 11, 15; 28. 7; 35. 11; 42. 4; 45. 15; 55. 10;

Tibi: 1. 3, 8; 13. 2; 14. 7, 9, 16; 15. 1; 23. 5, 15, 19; 35. 16; 38. 6; 40. 3; 49. 4;

Sibi: 10. 23; 36. 4.

¹Thesaurus II, 1776, 57.

²Cf. Kroll on 5. 7.

³Cf. p. 55, supra.

⁴Cf. Harpers' Latin Dict. s. v.

Besides the above listed 37 instances,¹ there are but 10 of these pronominal forms in other positions in hendecasyllabics: mihi, 10. 32; 15. 5; 58b. 7; tibi, 32. 6; 50. 16; sibi, 10. 30; and elided, eg(o), 10. 16; mih(i), 21. 7; 58b. 10; tib(i), 54. 5. Thus, of 47 instances all told, 37 stand in the one position where such words especially serve the verse-structure. By contrast, these words in other kinds of verse, though there are 135 instances, have no regularity of position.² This is the more noteworthy in view of the fact that these pronominals may count either as 0 0, or 0 - in verse. Catullus, however, never scans ego, 0 -. But the datives at least (positions possible by elision omitted) might stand not only in the pyrrhic in hendecasyllabics, but also are metrically possible in 5 other positions, in the form, 0 - (cf. Table II, positions 3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 12). Yet it is remarkable that of a total of 42 instances of these datives in hendecasyllabics, only 6 (about 14 per cent) stand in positions requiring the scansion, 0 -, whereas in other kinds of verse, of a total of 103 instances, 36 (about 35 per cent) are placed with the scansion, 0 -. It seems evident, then, that these pronominals are particularly useful in forming the pyrrhic in hendecasyllabics.

In this connection, it is interesting to note that in several cases it seems that the pronouns would normally be omitted, since they are scarcely necessary for emphasis, contrast, or meaning. Thus, ego, 58b. 3, is clearly, to use Kroll's word, Versfüllung. In 16. 1, pedicabo ego vos, ego perhaps somewhat intensifies the threat, but elsewhere in such expressions it is omitted, as for example, ad librariorum curram scrinia . . . omnia colligam venena, 14. 18, 19, which is not only a threat, but a threatened revenge, where ego might well be used for emphasis. Similarly, in 21. 8, tangam te prior irrumatione, there is the same threat in the same tone, but no ego. Again in 14. 4, nam quid feci ego quidve sum locutus, the emphasis in thought is on feci and locutus, not ego, and Plautus has a similar expression with no ego: quid de te merui qua me causa perderes, Men. 490. In 56. 6, trusantem: hunc ego . . . cecidi, ego seems to turn the attention on himself, much like the French, moi, je. But

¹Similarly, these pronominals recur in Martial 165 times forming the pyrrhic in hendecasyllabics: ego, 6 times; mihi, 52 times; tibi, 98 times; sibi, 9 times.

²Except in Galliambics, c. 63, where all but 4, of a total of 23, stand in the pyrrhic sequence at the beginning of the first or third foot, where such sequence is difficult to fill, since it always co-incides with the beginning of a word.

there seems no more necessity here for such usage than, for example, in 50. 7, where ego with abii would similarly turn the attention to himself. Again, in 28. 11, where attention shifts from himself to Veranius and Fabullus, fuistis might well have a personal pronoun, but there is none. In 9. 5, o mihi nuntii beati, the pronoun seems no more necessary than, for example, in 26. 5, o ventum horribilem, where nobis (or vobis, according to how v. 1 is read) would make quite as good syntax as here. In 35. 11, si mihi vera nuntiantur, mihi somewhat lessens the gossip nature of the remark by making it too specific; compare Cicero, si quidem quae nuntiantur ulla ex parte vera sunt, Fam. x. 33. 1. In 14. 16, non, non hoc tibi, false, sic abibit, tibi with abibit seems unnecessary when compared with Terence, mirabar hoc si sic abiret, Andr. 175. Again, in 7. 1, quaeris quot mihi, who would he mean other than himself? Tibi, 38. 6, detracts from the impatient brevity of the line. Tibi, 14. 9, seems scarcely necessary after tibi, v. 7. Mihi, 12, 11, with remitte is no more necessary than a pronoun with expecta. Se is omitted in 42. 4, yet it is more to be expected than mihi, which is expressed. In certain other passages also, the pronouns would usually be omitted. However, it is likely that the personal pronouns were used much more frequently in colloquial speech¹ than in the literary Latin which we are accustomed to regard as the norm, and although, as just pointed out, Catullus' own practice in the matter does not seem to be consistent, doubtless some of the above mentioned instances have nuances which we moderns do not fully appreciate. In any case our present knowledge is too inexact to set up any absolute rules as to the 'normal' use of pronouns.² Hence we shall not press the matter further here.

In some few cases, the syntax is of especial interest.

In 12. 11, we have remitto, and in 12. 15; 14. 7, mitto, with the dative, though ad or in with the accusative, especially with the simple verb, is much the commoner. Catullus has the dative with this verb altogether 8 times, and in all cases the dative is mihi or tibi forming 0 0 in dactylic sequences. By contrast, when he uses a noun, he has in all cases ad or in with accusative: ad tuum Catullum misti, 14. 13; mittetur ad undas, 95. 5; misso in Syriam, 84. 7.

In some few cases, the datives above listed are the so-called 'sympathetic adnominal dative' or 'dative instead of the

¹Hofmann, Lat. Umgangssprache (Heidelberg, 1926), p. 100.

²For bibliography on use of pronouns see Thesaurus V, 2, 258, 3.

genitive or possessive.¹ Thus, collo sibi, 10. 23, is practically equivalent of collo suo; culus tibi, 23. 19, of culus tuus; mihi medullis, 45. 15, of meis medullis.² So also, though of quite different grammatical category, in mihi passerem abstulistis, 3. 15; mihi linteum remitte, 12. 11; Camerium mihi, 55. 10, the meaning might equally well be expressed by possessives. But the datives give pyrrhics, whereas the appropriate possessives would form iambic sequences.

Mihi passerem abstulistis, 3. 15, and mihi vestra reddituram, 42. 4, are obscure as to the precise force of the pronoun. Mihi, 3. 15, according to Kroll, suggests that Catullus regards Lesbia's grief as his own. Mihi, 42. 4, seems to imply, as Merrill puts it, an 'identification of the poet with his own verses.' The psychology of the two passages is similar; in the one, mihi implies that the poet shares the sparrow with Lesbia, in the other, the verses with his tablets. In both, the plural, nobis, would seem more natural, as in mutanda est ratio modusque nobis, 42. 22. But nobis is a spondee, mihi, a pyrrhic.

Finally, the two instances of mihi, 9. 2, 5. Editors and grammarians cannot agree on the syntax of the pronouns, and indeed of other words, in these passages.³ It is needless to add to the discussion here, but it is to be observed that in both cases, omission of the pronoun would in no way obscure the meaning, but would simplify the syntax, especially in v. 2. Both of these unnecessary mihi's fulfil the need of unbroken pyrrhics, and under the circumstances, this seems to be the factor determining the use of them.

Nouns and Adjectives in -ulus (-olus), and -culus

The following lines have the pyrrhic formed of nouns and adjectives in -ulus (-olus), and -culus, diminutives:⁴

The element, -ul-, forming the first short of the pyrrhic:
Giving the verse-type, - 0 0: sacculus, 13. 8; flosculus,

¹Landgraf, "Dativus commodi," ALL, VIII (1893), 40 f.; Bennett, Syntax of Early Latin (Boston, 1914), II, 134 f.

²Cf. Kroll on mihi, 63. 15.

³Cf. Baehrens, Ellis, Kroll, and authorities cited.

⁴Cf. p. 34, n. 1, supra. In the present list are included some words which are not diminutives, indicated by underlining of the verse-references; in doubtful cases reference to authorities is given.

24. 1; villula, 26. 1;

The element, -ul-, forming the second short:

Giving the verse-type, 0 0: popul(o), 33. 7; catul(1),¹

42. 9;

Giving the verse-type, - 0 0: mollicul(1), 16. 8;

ridicul(a), 56. 4; lecticul(o),² 57. 7;

Giving the verse-type, 0 0 -: oculis, 3. 5; tremuli, 6.

10; oculos, 9. 2; oculis, 14. 1; populo, 15. 6; vetuli, 27. 1;

tabulis, 28. 6; oculos, 48. 1; maculae,³ 57. 3;

Giving the verse-type, - 0 0 -: aureolum, 2. 12;

turgiduli, 3. 18; versiculis, 16. 3; molliculi, 16. 4; versiculos,

16. 6; sarcinulis, 28. 2; turpiculo, 41. 3; versiculos, 50. 4;

lacteolae, 55. 17; ridiculam, 56. 1;

Giving the verse-type, - - 0 0 -: solaciolum, 2. 7;

Veraniolum, 12. 17; Veraniolo, 47. 3.

Thus there are some 30 nouns and adjectives of this sort supplying pyrrhic sequences in hendecasyllabics,⁴ the majority of which are diminutives.

In other positions in this kind of verse, there are but 4 instances of such diminutives: lectulo, 50. 15; pupulum, 56. 5; erudituli, 57. 7; puellularum, 57. 9.

In other kinds of verse, there are about 42 instances.⁵

¹Gow, "Diminutives in Aug. Poetry," *CQ*, XXVI (1932), 151; Ernout-Meillet, *Dict. étym.* (Paris, 1932), and Walde, *Lat. etym. Wörterbuch* (Heidelberg, 1910), s. v.

²Lecticulo, 0, is surely to be preferred to lectulo, GR, for since it is the reading of 0, it has the greater traditional authority, and it is, besides, the lectio difficilior. The word is found here only, but this is scarcely an argument against it, as there are several such words among the diminutives of Catullus. Cf. Merrill, Kroll, *ad loc.*

³Gow, *loc. cit.*, p. 150; Ernout-Meillet, and Walde, *opp. citt.*, s. v.

⁴Martial has 67 instances: 28 ending in 0 0, with the element, -ul-, forming the first short; 39 ending in 0 0 -, with the element, -ul-, forming the second, there being no cases of elision.

⁵Palmulis, 4. 4; palmulas, 4. 17; ponticuli, 17. 3; assulis, 17. 3; bimuli, 17. 13; tenellula, 17. 15; cuniculi, 25. 1 (Grebe, *Studia Catull.* [Amsterdam, 1912], p. 115; cf. Ernout-Meillet, *op. cit.*, s. v.); medullula, 25. 2; imula, 25. 2; latusculum, 25. 10; albulus, 29. 8; amiculi, 30. 2; ramulis, 61. 22; zonula, 61. 53; puellulam, 61. 57; hortulo, 61. 92; aureolos, 61. 167;

These are for the most part scattered in various positions in different kinds of verse. The only other kind of verse having a considerable number is dactylic; in hexameters and elegiacs, there are some 18 instances, all of which form pyrrhic sequences, but it is to be observed that there are some 2780 pyrrhic sequences in those poems, whereas there are only 527 in hendecasyllabics. Of the 18 in dactylic verse, 8 stand at the beginning of the line.¹ Of the 10 instances in Glyconics, 6 stand at the end of the verse.² But no other kind of verse has so many instances as hendecasyllabic, nor is the regularity of position so marked. Thus, of about 66 diminutives of this sort in Catullus, 24 occur in hendecasyllabics, and all but 4 of these provide the pyrrhic sequence undivided.

It is to be observed here too³ that some of these words are rare in the diminutive form. Lecticulus is not found elsewhere.⁴ Solaciolum is found elsewhere but once.⁵ Flosculus in the tropical sense applied to persons occurs but twice elsewhere.⁶ Aureolus in the literal sense,⁷ is relatively rare.⁸ Lacteolus, molliculus, turgidulus, turpiculus, and villula are quoted from but a few authors each.⁹

In most cases, Catullus himself has the simplex elsewhere. Aureolus he has once elsewhere, but aureus 3 times; flosculus here

bracchiolum, 61. 181; puellulae, 61. 182; puellulam, 61. 188; floridulo, 61. 193; parvulus, 61. 216; lassulae, 63. 35; pupula, 63. 56; lectulus, 64. 88; munuscula, 64. 103; frigidulos, 64. 131; aridulis, 64. 316; languidulos, 64. 331; pallidulum, 65. 6; lacrimulis, 66. 16; uvidulam, 66. 63; sicula, 67. 21 (Ernout-Meillet, op. cit., s. v. sica); auriculam, 67. 44; capsula, 68. 36; oscula, 68. 127; munuscula, 68. 145; perluciduli, 69. 4; avunculus, 84. 5 (Gow, loc. cit., p. 153; Paucker, "Diminutive mit dem Suff. -c-ulus," Zeitschr. Öst. Gym., XXVII [1876], 598; Ernout-Meillet, op. cit., s. v.); saviolum, 99. 2; articulis, 99. 8; saviolum, 99. 14.

¹64. 88, 131, 331; 65. 6; 66. 63; 68. 127; 99. 2, 14.

²61. 22, 57, 92, 182, 188, 216.

³Cf. p. 36, supra.

⁴Cf. p. 64, n. 2, supra.

⁵CIL VIII, 7427.

⁶Thesaurus VI, 1, 938, 63.

⁷If, indeed, this be the right interpretation; cf. Kroll.

⁸Thesaurus II, 1488.

⁹Cf. Harpers' Latin Dict., s. vv.; Platner, "Diminutives in Cat." AJP, XVI (1895), 188-200.

only, but flos 10 times; lecticulus here only, lectulus twice, but lectus 5 times; molliculus here only, elsewhere mollicellus once, but mollis 15 times; turpiculus here only, but turpis 7 times; Veraniolus here only, but Veranius 3 times; versiculus here only, versus twice elsewhere; vetulus here only, vetus 8 times.

Here too,¹ in some cases, the diminutive seems to differ in meaning but little, if at all, from the simplex. Aureolum, 2. 12, can scarcely be felt to differ to any great extent from aureum. In 66. 60, Catullus uses the simplex, where the star is speaking of Berenice's crown, a passage in which the affectionate tone of the diminutive would be, if anything, more appropriate than here. Aureolos, 61. 167, is used of the bride's feet, and the diminutive seems more fitting.² Flosculus, 24. 1, may have some nuance of feeling,³ but the whole poem is petulant rather than affectionate, and there are other passages in which the simplex is used where the diminutive form seems even more applicable than here, as for example, 11. 23; 62. 39.⁴ Lacteolae, 55. 17, differs but little from the simplex as used in Martial, iii. 58. 22, and Aeneid, x. 137.⁵ Lecticulo, 57. 7, seems to have no diminutive connotation, so far as meaning is concerned, but the sound of the word, coupled with erudituli, giving a double assonance, probably heightens the idea of contempt.⁶ Similarly, versiculis, versiculos, 16. 3, 6, molliculi, 16. 4, 8, have a peculiar sound-effect, but differ in meaning very little from their positives;⁷ compare also sarcinulis, 28. 2; sacculus, 13. 8;⁸ solaciolum, 2. 7.⁹ The diminutive, Veraniolum, 12. 17; 47. 3, is sometimes understood as indicating that Veranius is 'the greater favourite of the two,'¹⁰

¹Cf. p. 37, *supra*.

²Cf. Platner, *loc. cit.*, p. 186; De Labriolle, "L'emploi du dim. chez Cat.," *Rev. de Phil.*, XXIX (1905), 281.

³De Labriolle, *ibid.*, p. 284.

⁴Kroll, *ad loc.* says: Das Deminutivum dient dazu, einen Daktylus zu liefern, und klingt etwas intimer als das Simplex flos.

⁵Cf. Platner, *loc. cit.*, p. 188.

⁶Cf. de Labriolle, Platner, *locc. citt.*, pp. 283, 196; Ferrari, "Uso dei diminutivi in Cat.," *Athenaeum*, III (1915), 450.

⁷Cf. Platner, Ferrari, *locc. citt.*, pp. 189, 449.

⁸Cf. Platner, de Labriolle, *locc. citt.*, pp. 198, 280.

⁹Kroll *ad loc.* seems to regard the diminutive as used largely because of its metrical convenience; cf. Platner, Ferrari, *locc. citt.*, pp. 199, 449.

¹⁰Ellis on 12. 17; cf. Ferrari, *loc. cit.*, p. 449.

but this is surely attributing very bad taste to Catullus, for who would mention two friends together in the same affectionate way, only to draw a distinction in esteem between them? Other passages show that Catullus had an equal love for both.¹

With these diminutives, as with those in -llus, it seems clear that their convenient metrical form, supplying unbroken pyrrhics, is of importance in determining the use of them.

- - - -

The diminutives, vetuli, 27. 1, and catuli, 42. 9, are of unusual interest in the matter of assonance.² Neither seems to differ essentially in meaning or stylistic from the usual forms, veteris and canis, and the latter are also metrically suitable. Note, however, the difference in sound between: minister veteris puer Falerni, and, minister vetuli puer Falerni. In the former, there is responsion between the n's and the r's, but in the latter with the diminutive, there are not only these responsions, but also that of the l's and t's, and at the same time, the monotonous repetition of 'er' is broken.

Similarly, compare: ridentem canis ore Gallicani, and ridentem catuli ore Gallicani. In the former, there is responsion between the nasals, the m and the n's, and between the r's, but in the latter, with the diminutive, not only are there these responsions, but also that of the l's, and the monotony of three successive nasals is avoided.

These two examples seem to show a nice balancing between the desire to have responsions of the same sound on the one hand, and to avoid monotony on the other.

¹See Merrill on 12. 13; 28. 3.

²Cf. pp. 41, 55, supra.

